**OENG1115, Assessment item 3:** Project Presentation (Group assessment)

**Weighting of final grade:** 20%

**Related course learning outcomes:** 3

**Presentation date:** Week 12, 13th of October 2020

**Groups:** To be determined, consistent with OENG1117

**Assessment description:** You will work with your group members to develop and present a compelling presentation pitch which outlines and defends the integration of an innovation or new technology into an engineering project.

**Assessment detail:** Based on one of the Course projects your group will prepare a convincing, focused and polished 5 min presentation pitch for managing the integration and on-going management of a technology or innovation. Your group will be prepared to field 5 min approx. of questions (total time: presentation + questions = 10 min approx). It is critical that you work as an effective group to prepare for and defend the presentation.

Your group will:

1. Select and give a succinct overview of the technology or innovation
2. Convincingly but succinctly outline a value proposition for its introduction into the project selected
3. Describe how you will manage key stakeholders
4. Outline your proposed process to mitigate risk and metrics to support value creation (successful integration) or to identify failure

**Presentation style:**

* The presentation will take strictly no more than 5 min. There will be a further 5 min (approx) of questions by the examiners
* Slide one will provide:
  + Presentation Title
  + Group members including student numbers
  + One sentence on each group member’s contribution.
* Each presentation will have 3 slides (including Slide 1 above) and no more than 2 presenters (questions should be predominately fielded by team members that did not present)

**Marking Rubric (OENG1115, Assessment 3)**

### Presenting Group: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Assessing person |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Maximum Marks* | Marks Awarded | Minimum Marks |
| *Format:*  The presentation:   * Followed the instructions provided. * Was on topic, logically set out, and provided clear relevant information. * Aides (eg slides) were effective and interesting. Text, tables and figures were easy to read. | *3 Marks in total possible* | The presentation was:   * Off topic * Poor quality design, no logical format, confusing * Presentation aides were non-existent or not effective. * Not sufficient pictures/graphics, too many words – too small font |
| *Content:*  The presentation was:   * On-topic clear, well-structured, justified, considered and argued relevant to the project selected and convincing * Made reference to theory/models to support decisions made * Considered limitations, constraints and benefits & provided innovative contributions * Considered technological, practical and organisational, external factors * Provided information at the appropriate level | 10 Marks in total possible | The presentation was:   * Ill considered, not well justified, not convincing * Off topic * Provided little or no consideration of the project constraints, external issues * No reference to theory/models or deep thought process to support decisions made or entire proposal * Did not answer all components of task |
| *Style & Performance:*   * Evidence of effective group work and acknowledgment of contributions * Clear, interesting and effective presentation style * On time and no hick-ups * Convincing and polished | *3 Marks in total possible* | * Ineffective team work * Off topic, presentation was read. * Unprofessional and/or distracting behaviour, not interesting / clear / convincing to the audience. * Poor time keeping * Technical difficulties (not tested first) |
| *Questions:*   * Questions were answered succinctly, logically and effectively * Evidence of deep thinking and wide reading to the support presentation * Team was coordinated and organised – members knew who would answer which type of question, team supported each other | 4 marks in total possible | * Questions were not answered or poor confusing off topic and distracting answers provided * No evidence of academic insight into the work presented, questions were not taken seriously * Team was uncoordinated and disorganised in responding |
| Overall score: |  | /20 |

COMMENTS: