

DR and Capstone PRESENTATION Evaluation

Qualitative review of presentations to provide constructive feedback

Presenting Team: **Lev Tours**

Reviewed by: PiWatcher

Date of Review: 11/17/2020

Presentation being reviewed: Design Review I

PART I: The Presentation Content (we'll get to video tech and delivery later):

A. Problem Statement: How did the team do on this critical first leg of the talk?

- Did the talk: Clearly describe the project?

Project is clearly described by explaining Phase 3 of the project. I thought the phase 1 and 2 portions of one of the slides added fluff and distracted from what the solution actually is.

- Make it clear why this project is important by connecting it to its real-world importance/impact?

The connection to the real world is mentioned, but the impact/importance of the application is not clearly defined.

- Did the intro move smoothly from big picture to what the client does to what the client's problem challenge is generally; to what specific problems the client has?

Yes, the presenter explained information about the robotics industry and the client's background and followed up with the client's issue with the current implementation.

B. Solution Overview: Did the talk then make it clear what they are building and why/how it solves the problems outlined in the last step? Did the talk:

- Say what exactly is being built: a web app, a mobile app, a linux package, etc.

Yes, they explicitly talk about the different key points of what they are building to

solve the problem.

- Give you a good solid idea of what their solution looks like and what its overall approach to solving the problem is?

There's a general idea of how to approach the problem by providing a GUI and corresponding wifi navigation toolkit, but there are no real specifics regarding these two major aspects of the solution. It's very difficult to visualize the solution.

- Go through and highlight the key features, convincing that they directly solve the client's needs outlined before.

Yes, the key features that are highlighted are well explained.

C. The Geeky Details: Hopefully the team has you fully hooked on their idea at this point; now would be the time for them to fill in some details. How did talk do with:

- Review the key requirements developed with the sponsor and how this was done?

The Key Requirements were provided but not clearly labeled and no mention of the sponsor or how they gathered them were made.

- Review the overall architecture of their solution, including a review and brief justification of the technologies that they used.

It's very unclear as to what the architecture of the solution actually is, no specific technologies were referenced, only the general requirements of the solution were mentioned along with a brief about the previous iterations of the project.

- At some point (maybe even in the Solution overview of intro, maybe here or later) you'd want to see a walk-through/demo of their product, showing it in action. Preferably it shows their product literally solving a typical client use case.

Use cases were not presented and a demo was not shown.

- Review some challenges they faced and how they solved them?

Yes they clearly reviewed and explained how to overcome certain challenges

- Review their entire project development timeline. The idea is to give you a broad sense of how they tackled the problem from start to finish, highlighting the main development phases.

No specific times were referenced in the timeline. In fact, it is arguable that this is the most egregious portion of the presentation. No one was able to decipher what the chart represented at first glance. Without commentary it would be impossible to decipher or even determine that the chart provided was a timeline at all.

- Review of Testing Plan. The team should overview their testing plan and, ideally, give some preliminary results. The result should be you feeling satisfied that they're delivering a well-tested, refined product.

There wasn't a testing plan.

D. The cherry on the cake: How was the conclusion? Did it leave you feeling impressed and satisfied? Specifically, did the talk:

- Loop back in the conclusion to remind you of the big picture importance of the problem/project?

Yes they revisited the big picture in their conclusion. They can do more to stress the importance of it though. After listening to it again it is briefly mentioned right before they end the presentation.

- Summarize the key problems the client had and the key product features that address them?

No, it only addressed one key problem the client had. More problems needed to be addressed for this to be an effective conclusion.

- Say something about the potential *impact* of their product? Lives saved? Time/money saved for clients? Value for client (i.e. person-hours invested by team * typical software consulting hour cost = value).

There is a mention to the benefit of students learning robotics, however, this is the only impact referenced. It would have been more effective to mention the effect of robotics development on the larger whole of society.

- Talk about the future: What are the plans for deployment? How has the client reacted to the product?

No plans for deployment or client reaction were presented.

PART II: The Presentation DELIVERY

We've talked about content completeness and flow. But how was the delivery in this new video format? Did the team rise to the challenge? This is where you can really help the team with their video technique and technologies.

A: The Basics: Start by just rating each of the following on a scale of 5(best) to (1) worst. Plus give 1-2 sentences to explain the rating.

- Visibility of slide content - 5

The content was clearly visible and can be seen easily.

- Quality of speaker audio (clarity, volume, etc.) - 5

The speaker audio was clear and the volume was appropriate.

- Visibility of the speaker, if/when images of the speaker were integrated. To what extent was the speaker visible (resolution, size, placement of image). Give a '1' if no speaker images were integrated. - 1

There were no videos of images of the speakers provided the slides. Providing a video of you speaking would help a lot.

- Quality of transitions between speakers and/or parts of the talk. - 5

The transition between speakers was sufficient and did not interrupt the flow of the presentation.

B: Recommendations for improvement: Briefly comment on specific technical items or areas where you feel the team could focus to make their video presentation feel more smooth and professional. Remember, we're focusing on delivery here, not content. Try to give at least two specific recommendations that you feel would most help.

Please provide a video of you presenting the presentation. It makes it easier to make a connection.

Along with that, to make it easier to follow, provide diagrams and images of the workflow of the solution to see how each technology works and integrates well with each other. Following along as group members read off the slides word for word is a very ineffective way to deliver a presentation. In addition to a lack of visuals, the slides were colorless thus making it harder to maintain the audience's attention with the use of monotone colors.

C: Evaluative Estimations: Think about the presentation again. As a summary of all your comments, what grade would you give the team on this attempt? Score using A-F, with +/- on any grade allowed. Note that you are not giving “THE grade” (their team mentor does that), you’re just giving an overall indication of how you’d rate it.

- Grade for Slides, Flow, and Content (Part 1): C
- Grade for Technical Video Presentation (Part 2): B
- OVERALL, we’d give this presentation a: C+

Instructions: Use this document as a template for preparing your review.

1. Start by filling in the header info: team being reviewed, your team, what presentation this is, and date.
2. After watching the presentation video, go through and fill in comments in the section above. **Use a different color for your comments**, to clearly distinguish your comments from template text.
3. Try to be thoughtful, specific, and constructive about your comments. Something like “kind of weak, could use improvement” is not helpful. Be specific. Your reviews will be graded on thoughtfulness, completeness and quality of advice.
4. When you are done, save this document as a PDF, and mail to both the team leader and to **your** team mentor (not the mentor of the reviewed team!).