

## Design Review 2:

### Presentation Evaluation

Qualitative review of presentations to provide constructive feedback

Presenting Team: Smart Talk \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed by: PiWatcher \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Review: 03/05/2021 \_\_\_\_\_

Presentation being reviewed: Design Review 2 \_\_\_\_\_

#### **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?

**Yes, the project is to create a software package to help new language learners with their pronunciation, while allowing instructors to easily create new lesson plans in a gamified fashion.**

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

**Don't believe they really hit on this. From the presentation we got that it was a language learning application however we do not know what it is for. They mentioned in the Problem Statement that they want designers and teachers to get a customized experience**

- 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 introduction from the big picture to what the client does. However the speaker mentioned "research tools" but never goes into what they are which is important for understanding the context of the project.**

**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 explained that they wanted to create a gamified mobile app with web integration that is enjoyable and engaging**

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

**Yes, they explained that they wanted to create a gamified mobile application using a web application and a mobile application.**

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

**Yes, they highlight features where users are able to track their progress through badges and user progress.**

**C. The MAIN BODY of the talk:** Hopefully the presentation team has you clear on the project and it's motivation and fully hooked on their cool solution concept. Now it's time for them to give you the detail. Exactly what goes in this BODY section depends on the focus of the DR: for DR2, we are focused on describing the software design and architecture that resulted from your design process, ending with some discussion of coding progress. How did talk do with this flow:

- Review the key requirements driving the project. This is typically a one-slide condensation of the key requirements they developed last term, with verbal content smoothly reminding us of how requirements were acquired and what the highlights are.

**Not needed for this Design Review**

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

**They go through the overall architecture of their entire solution and provide justification for the technologies that they use.**

- THE MEAT: The presentation should now dig more into the design details. This might start with a big UML diagram to give an overview of the end result, but should

then dig into only one or two modules just to give you a taste of what the completed design looks like at the lowest level. They could then refer listeners to the written doc for full details on all modules. The key question: Did you come away feeling that their *design process* was orderly and complete, and that the resulting design appears robust and solid.

**Yes, they provided really good UML diagrams that provide details on all the modules that they are definitely. Current design looks robust and solid.**

- Review some challenges they faced and how they solved them? In this stage of the design process, you'd expect to hear about challenges related to coding and implementation.

**They provided several challenges that they are facing in regards to Automatic Speech Recognition and went over potential resolutions such as recoding the plugin or using a different plugin for the different platform.**

- Review their project development timeline. The idea is to orient you in the process as a whole, and give you a clear sense of where the team is on the key tasks. You should get a quick but clear impression of the main tasks, as well as future upcoming tasks. Do you get a clear sense that they are ahead/on-time/slipping?

**Yes, they provide a clear sense of where the team is on the key tasks and also direct conversation to what they have completed and what incoming key tasks are.**

**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: motivations, the key problems the client had and the key product features that address them?

**Yes, they looped back on the conclusion and provided the important factors of the entire project such as key motivations, key problems, and the product that they are delivering.**

- Review the highlights of this particular DR: Review what they've accomplished in the design phase (problems solved, UML specs produced, etc.) and where they are now, i.e., how's the coding coming along.

**Yes, they summarized important key factors of the design phase, where they are now, and how the coding is coming along.**

- Nice to end with getting back to the client: how has the client been involved, are they happy with progress, etc. End by saying something like “we hope to show you the completed prototype in a few weeks”, i.e., positive ending.

**Mentioned how the client is utilizing easier tools for this project. They are confident they will be able to finish the project as projected in the schedule despite the setbacks.**

## **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

**The slide content was visible and easy to read. Especially when showing the UML diagram for the database, it was still easy to read what was inside the diagrams themselves.**

**Score: 5**

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

**The audio quality was clear and audible. There was no issue understanding any of the speakers.**

**Score: 5**

- 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.

**The resolution, size, and placement of the video feeds from each presenter was good. The video of the speaker did not block any important content on the presentation.**

**Score: 5**

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

**The transitions between speakers was effective and smooth. Well done stating the name of the presenter going next.**

**Score: 5**

**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.

- **The use of terminology and word choice could have been thought out more to better represent the project's description. Explaining the meanings of CAPT and ASR acronyms earlier in the presentation would make it easier to follow throughout.**
- **Minimize the usage of filler words (mainly noticed in the first half of the presentation)**

**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): **A**

OVERALL, we'd give this presentation a: **A-**