teau 5

Penelope, sasho.

BME 260L Oral Presentation Grading Rubric - PBL #1

| , | | 2 | \ |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | ٤ |) |
| 1 | | 1 | |
| / | _ | | |

Introduction, Background, Motivation Introduced self and team of infreduce all teem members 10 Identified motivation and relevant background for model 0 notivation often before badeground. My preumonia ~ busy graph **Problem Definition, Key Results** Stated clear goal(s) of model of. 5 Presented summary of key results early in talk Lasta hed #5. read a francisc **Model Description** Clearly presented conceptual/representational multi-component model w/diagram 15 (0 Described chemical components \checkmark Key mathematical equations that describe system _ walked thru well Stated assumptions clearly enough - not steeling twiter, but and one - drd define variables, if inconsistent in fort hard-watters - agris not passe othe. — little to distance super si dear, but if is there Model Results Showed numerical values for rates of flow, chemical reaction, concentrations, etc. 20 for selected chemical components (table, graph or other visuals). Focused on important aspects - don't know what to do of calculated #'s (slide 13). -didn't show that "healthy condition works" - healthy us extrang pit ~ good ideal but not deal - walked thru graphs on - stide 23 is unusable. - and 24- To don't make sense.

if of ader

| Evaluation and Conclusion Identified appropriate strengths and weaknesses of model Summarized implications for work -> really good restard conclusions | 2 | 5 |
|---|----------|------------|
| Planned a conclusion dead space weakness contradicted your results (neglex?) | | |
| - leter value needs reference. [no calcs!] | | |
| - leter value needs reference. [no caics!] - another implications - actually a weaknesses - don't s | ay"th | of's it |
| Visuals | | • |
| • Informative slide titles | 10 | 20 |
| Appropriate number of words and items on slides Used font sizes/images that could be seen easily | • | |
| Background did not interfere with diagrams or text | i i | |
| High quality figures, tables, diagrams | | |
| • Colors were easy to view | | |
| - no double titles. | | |
| - lines on graph should 80. | | |
| - don't voderline titles | | |
| -don't underline titles -hend written regns not OK to an falk (ou for A) | pperli | 1) |
| - Nond. Williams | | |
| | | |
| Delivery Avoided fillers such as "uhm" "like" "you know" Looked at all portions of audience Did not read to audience much from screen Used hand gestures effectively Appeared confident and enthusiastic | 15 | 20 |
| 5: (ooked at streen; furn budy to audience p: spoke doorly, & coudly. | | |
| p: spoke doorly, & cordly. S: don't auss onnis. | | |
| | | |
| | <u> </u> | |
| | | |
| Question and Answer Period | 7 | .5 |
| \$-01-ty-to repeat; same 02. | 1.5 | - |
| - answers on - - foo much stide flipping | | |
| - for much stidl tupping | | |
| TOTAL | | 100 |
| | | |

Team 5 - Sashar & Penolope

BME 260L Oral Presentation Grading Rubric - PBL #1

| | Score | Max |
|---|----------------------------------|------------|
| Introduction, Background, Motivation | s Vice and and and a live of the | (<u> </u> |
| • Introduced self and team \(\square\$ | | 10 |
| Identified motivation and relevant background for model | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Problem Definition, Key Results | <u> </u> | |
| Stated clear goal(s) of model | ļ | 5 |
| Presented summary of key results early in talk | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Mr. J. ID | | |
| Model Description | | |
| Clearly presented conceptual/representational multi-component model w/diagram Described chemical components | | 15 |
| Described chemical components Key mathematical equations that describe system | | |
| Stated assumptions clearly | | |
| Stated assumptions crearry | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Model Results | - | |
| • Showed numerical values for rates of flow, chemical reaction, concentrations, etc. | | 20 |
| for selected chemical components (table, graph or other visuals). | | 20 |
| • Focused on important aspects | | |
| · • | | |
| % change table would be better as bur graph | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Evaluation and Conclusion Identified appropriate strengths and weaknesses of model√ Summarized implications for work Planned a conclusion | A | 5 |
|---|---|-----|
| Visuals • Informative slide titles • Appropriate number of words and items on slides • Used font sizes/images that could be seen easily • Background did not interfere with diagrams or text • High quality figures, tables, diagrams • Colors were easy to view Eqis would be easier to read if typed instead of hand-written | | 20 |
| | | |
| Delivery Avoided fillers such as "uhm" "like" "you know" Looked at all portions of audience Did not read to audience much from screen Used hand gestures effectively Appeared confident and enthusiastic | | 20 |
| Some purts mispoken Delivery monotone | , | |
| Question and Answer Period | • | -5 |
| TOTAL | | 100 |

Presenonter - Trainer, North, Blocana, Yampdaley, Mehrata, Benden

BME 260L Oral Presentation Grading Rubric - PBL #1

| | Score | Max |
|--|-------|-----|
| Introduction, Background, Motivation | | |
| Introduced self and team | | 10 |
| Identified motivation and relevant background for model | | |
| The state of the s | | |
| oretor general, | | |
| prestry generic, Num but comes late | | |
| Problem Definition Key Results | ļ. · | |
| • Stated clear goal(s) of model = + chear | | 5 |
| Presented summary of key results early in talk | | |
| Presented summary of key results early in talk This numerical results. | | |
| - Mizz roomer a room | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Model Description | | |
| Clearly presented conceptual/representational multi-component model w/diagram | | 15 |
| Described chemical components | | |
| Described chemical components Key mathematical equations that describe system Stated assumptions clearly | | - |
| Stated assumptions clearly | | |
| -why soes in att. gas levels in systemate? - what's weeth rel'n of partient flid prol? -ins=ins confuses, I consider mass I in rel'n | | |
| in the second | | |
| - what's next per of portbert flid pral. | | |
| Conere II | | |
| The The confuses, I consider mass | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Model Results | | |
| • Showed numerical values for rates of flow, chemical reaction, concentrations, etc. | | 20 |
| for selected chemical components (table, graph or other visuals). | | |
| Focused on important aspects | | |
| - existed as veriation lodes here small | | |
| - expired air variation looks very small - why does Coz chaze sig. none vs. a if | | |
| - why does to change sig. none us. a it | | |
| | | ÷ |
| N602= N7 Co2 | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | - | |
| | | |
| | | |

| | 1 | |
|--|---|----------|
| Evaluation and Conclusion Identified appropriate strengths and weaknesses of model Summarized implications for work Planned a conclusion Two like model Waster than how work Waster than how waster than how waster than how | | 5 |
| • Summarized implications for work | | |
| Planned a conclusion wide work with the winder of which | V | |
| | | |
| | | , |
| Visuals Informative slide titles pretty generic | | 20 |
| Appropriate number of words and items on slides | | |
| Used font sizes/images that could be seen easily Background did not interfere with diagrams or text | | |
| High quality figures, tables, diagrams | | |
| • Colors were easy to view V | V | |
| • Colors were easy to view the Colors were ea | | |
| acció d'interpretation | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Delivery • Avoided fillers such as "uhm" "like" "you know" have decent anount of fills • Locked at all parties of sydions | | 20 |
| • Looked at all portions of addience | | |
| Did not read to audience much from screenUsed hand gestures effectively | | |
| Appeared confident and enthusiastic | | |
| t proj. well | | |
| | 1 | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | . | |
| | | |
| Question and Answer Period | | 5 |
| con coord. arswers more | | |
| | 1 | <u> </u> |
| | | |
| TOTAL | | 100 |
| | | |