

Group Presentation Reviews

Group 4

Douglas Brown

Jessica Hale

Steve Mazza

Daniel Torres

February 22, 2012

All presenters did really well. We were impressed with the thorough understanding exhibited by all speakers and the manner in which the results were presented. Though everyone performed highly, we were most impressed with Group 6. The enclosed comments may, at times, be nit-picky and are not in any way meant to denigrate the obvious hard efforts of the teams. Our opinions are presented at your request and are intended solely for your personal use and are not intended for redistribution.

Group 5

- The background noise that was present throughout the presentation was somewhat distracting.
- On slide 2 it was not clear what supporting graphic was being referred to during the talk. It would have been easier to follow if they were allowed to break this slide out into several others.
- Slide 3 had a very clear supporting graphic.
- Slide 4 was also very well organized and presented clearly. Tabular data supported discussion.
- Summary was clear and ended with a single conclusion.

- Timing was adequate.
- Presentation sounded well rehearsed.

Group 2

- Content on the slides matched the soundtrack almost too well.
- Lots of words on the slides made the message of each slide less clear.
- Graphic on slide 2 was effective.
- 4 identical graphics on slide 3 took up a lot of space and lent little to the discussion.
- Extremely busy graphic in slide 4 showing how the rail gun works seemed out of place in this presentation.
- Timing was adequate.

Group 6

- Seemed well rehearsed.
- Introduction was clear and they asked up front for a decision.
- Presentation of decision criteria was clear.
- Use of graphics was effective and statistics were summarized in the discussion.
- Out of the box thinking to add a 3-gun system for consideration.
- Clear recommendation at the conclusion.

Group 1

- Group 1 had the most comprehensive analysis, thorough justification of the results and recommendations, and explanation of assumptions - but the data is meant to be spread across about 15 slides and the brief required a half hour.
- Slide 1 is extremely full and the data is overwhelming.

- Christine was clearly well rehearsed and presented well.
- Defined success and failure criteria instead of assuming 100% success rate (good).
- Slide 2 contains way too much raw data.
- Analysis on slide 3 was good. Summary is clear.