DR and Capstone PRESENTATION Evaluation

Qualitative review of presentations to provide constructive feedback

Presenting Team: **Birds iView**

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?

  We saw their problem as many people watch birds however the people watching the birds do not know the species of the bird they are watching. We believe their project is to identify the species of bird using their product.

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

  Birds iView presented an important connection by showing that there is a big market for bird watchers and that they spend over $40 billion. It would be good for the team to also address how much money on average each person spends on bird watching. However some downsides to the metrics provided on the introduction slide is that it doesn't specify what the timespan is over. Do people spend $40 billions per year? Over 5 years?

- 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 made sure to highlight the main concern of the current birdwatching workflow, and how the cost/time can be reduced from being able to properly identify the birds. As mentioned before, 800 per person vs 40 billion total would be more helpful in highlighting this transition.

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, Birds iView effectively describes what is being built. The overall technologies that they are going to provide are a community forum, a "peep learn" toolkit for easy setup of their hardware, and a web application for accurate bird species checking from user uploaded images.

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

  Yes, they go into depth on what will go into the solution and give a specific use case on how a user will interact with it.

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

  Yes, the provided flowchart with Jonas' explanation gave a more in depth solution to the problem previously stated.

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?

  This was not mentioned in the video. They went over key domain requirements however they did not mention the sponsor and how these requirements were developed.

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

  They mentioned using flask, mysql, and keras. I thought the justifications they had for using mysql and machine learning were very strong in terms of how the database is used to simplify machine learning, and how machine learning is used to identify birds using crowdsourced data.

- 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.

  They walked through the envisioned user interaction with their product and corresponding web application.

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

  Challenges that they faced and solved were not clearly addressed.

- 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.

  Displayed their entire project development timeline as a Gantt chart effectively. Should display the Gantt chart in days rather than in weeks. They highlight main development phases in their chart.

- 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.

  Testing plan was not clearly addressed and does not show how they are going to deliver a well-tested and refined product.

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 look back and provide an effective overview of the problem and project while stating its importance.

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

  The conclusion draws upon the key points of their solution adequately without going too into detail about specifics. It was a strong 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).

  Yes, they provide a visualization of how the product will impact the bird watching community.

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

  They discussed the plans for development in the upcoming semester however didn't mention the client's reaction.

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 - 4

  The visuals were decent but there wasn't a lot of variety in terms of how the diagrams were set up. Most were just sequential flow charts from left to right. I'd show the gantt chart with weeks instead of days, initially the chart was confusing.

- Quality of speaker audio (clarity, volume, etc.) - 4

  The audio was clear and of good volume. Speakers could be clearly understood.

- Visibility of the speaker, if/when images of speaker were integrated. To what extent was the speaker visible (resolution, size, placement of image). Give a '1' if no speaker images were integrated. - 5

  Speakers were clearly visible throughout the presentation. Resolution and size of the images were good.

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

  Transitions were sufficient, it was very clear when one speaker finished their section. Speakers did a good job of referencing the next section without hardly any latency.

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.

Ensure that every team member is wearing something professional before recording.

The content for the beginning was sufficient, however, providing a stronger speaker in the beginning for the intro and the problem overview would make it easier to understand the purpose of your solution.

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): A
- Grade for Technical Video Presentation (Part 2): B+
- OVERALL, we'd give this presentation a: A-

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!).