

TEAM ACRONYM		Review Initials & Date	
QFAU		EFCL 10/18/17	
Oral Presentation Rubric Element		Team Score and Comments	
General: overall favorable impression to the listener; the presenters points are clearly made and defended; observations are concise and well thought out; presentation is smooth and professional; pointing device is available and used appropriately to emphasize content.		Prot dress — (nice bvs casual) No pointer or clicker 4	
Audience: presentation demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the intended audience, and exhibits content and features that cater to that audience		4	
Content: presentation includes a clear exposition of technical detail appropriate to the audience; important material is in, distracting or irrelevant material, no matter how useful or correct, is out;		Good technical content Nice logo 4+	
Presentation Design: exhibit a visual design that is accessible and appealing; type size and font are consistent and easily visible under presentation conditions; professional appearing color choices; consistent use of color and graphic features; smooth and effective transition between slides		Nice font size nice 4+	
Graphics/Tables/Video: individual graphics (charts, photos, tables, diagrams, etc) are uncluttered, visible, consistent, and appropriately sized for presentation conditions; axes are legibly labeled; units are present; appropriate legends are provided;		Flow should be BD or graphic OK, but text a little small Data flow present but not well used	
PRESENTER	Presentation Style: clearly spoken; engaged with audience; confident and relaxed with the subject matter; notes or visual contact with the slides are not distractions to the audience; verbal tics are minimized; gestures are appropriate; questions are directly and thoroughly answered given time constraints of the presentation		
- Sabbar Ahmed	Good spee volume, a little fast. too Confident, but not smooth lots of voiced pause.		
Jeff Ozaerwa	A little soft, good speed.		
- Brian Weber	Volume ok, speed a little fast, eye contact fair, some lots of voiced pauses.		
Howard To	Speed mitigates accent, maily dunt. Volume good		

Key Review Area	Reviewer & Date:	Scoring 0-5 0 not addressed 1 minimal 2 less than desired 3 acceptable 4 good 5 outstanding
Project Description	Does the presentation provide an introduction to the project and it's purpose? Are the goals of the project clear and technically achievable?	Very good 4+
Project Requirements	Has the team established a concise set of high-level requirements? Have these requirements been reviewed and harmonized with the customer? Have they been decomposed into testable technical requirements? Has any consideration been given to how compliance with the requirements will be verified?	Cost & physical reqmts still det. clock, & power covered constraints 4+
Concept of Operations	How will the device be used? Does the team demonstrate any consideration of how the user will operate the device? Is there any identification of what human-machine interface will be required?	Yes, discussed 4-
Conceptual Design	Is there a conceptual design, even a very preliminary design as to how the project will be accomplished? Does the presentation show, at a high level, what is included in the project and what is not included in the project? Have unanswered design questions been identified, and is there an approach to getting the necessary answers in a timely fashion?	DFD, but not well covered. 4-
Interface Identification	Have the appropriate external interfaces been identified? Does the conceptual or preliminary design support these interfaces in an appropriate manner? Is there a discussion on the content or use of these interfaces?	All bus communication Scalability well established 4+
Development Tasks and Schedule	Has the team developed a reasonable series of development tasks? Does the team have a schedule that will result in completion of the necessary tasks by the end of the semester? Does the team have a method for tracking their progress?	Risks & challenges defined VHDL sim by end of sem. Nicely done gantt chart w/ details. 5-
Comments:		

TEAM ACRONYM		Review Initials & Date	
Galols Field		GNB	2017 1018
Oral Presentation Rubric Element		Team Score and Comments	
General: overall favorable impression to the listener; the presenters points are clearly made and defended; observations are concise and well thought out; presentation is smooth and professional; pointing device is available and used appropriately to emphasize content.		4+	- nice overall discussion on topic
Audience: presentation demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the intended audience, and exhibits content and features that cater to that audience		4	- described / defined topic initially
Content: presentation includes a clear exposition of technical detail appropriate to the audience; important material is in, distracting or irrelevant material, no matter how useful or correct, is out;		4	- technical detail described clearly
Presentation Design: exhibit a visual design that is accessible and appealing; type size and font are consistent and easily visible under presentation conditions; professional appearing color choices; consistent use of color and graphic features; smooth and effective transition between slides		4	- nice slide layout
Graphics/Tables/Video: individual graphics (charts, photos, tables, diagrams, etc) are uncluttered, visible, consistent, and appropriately sized for presentation conditions; axes are legibly labeled; units are present; appropriate legends are provided;		4	- functional flow text too small - front of room to those sitting in back
PRESENTER	Presentation Style: clearly spoken; engaged with audience; confident and relaxed with the subject matter; notes or visual contact with the slides are not distractions to the audience; verbal tics are minimized; gestures are appropriate; questions are directly and thoroughly answered given time constraints of the presentation		
Sabbir Ahmed LR	4	- good volume & eye contact	
Jeffrey Ogarzuvu LC	4	- keep volume up - good eye contact	
Howard TO R	4	- good volume & eye contact	
Brian Weber L	4	- good volume & eye contact	

Key Review Area	Reviewer & Date: <i>GNB</i> <i>20171018</i>	Scoring 0-5 0 not addressed 1 minimal 2 less than desired 3 acceptable 4 good 5 outstanding
Project Description	Does the presentation provide an introduction to the project and it's purpose? Are the goals of the project clear and technically achievable?	4 - architectural synthesis
Project Requirements	Has the team established a concise set of high-level requirements? Have these requirements been reviewed and harmonized with the customer? Have they been decomposed into testable technical requirements? Has any consideration been given to how compliance with the requirements will be verified?	4 - identified requirements - trades identified
Concept of Operations	How will the device be used? Does the team demonstrate any consideration of how the user will operate the device? Is there any identification of what human-machine interface will be required?	4 - functional & data flow diagrams
Conceptual Design	Is there a conceptual design, even a very preliminary design as to how the project will be accomplished? Does the presentation show, at a high level, what is included in the project and what is not included in the project? Have unanswered design questions been identified, and is there an approach to getting the necessary answers in a timely fashion?	4+ - implemented in an FPGA - test/measurement discussed
Interface Identification	Have the appropriate external interfaces been identified? Does the conceptual or preliminary design support these interfaces in an appropriate manner? Is there a discussion on the content or use of these interfaces?	4 - challenges identified
Development Tasks and Schedule	Has the team developed a reasonable series of development tasks? Does the team have a schedule that will result in completion of the necessary tasks by the end of the semester? Does the team have a method for tracking their progress?	4+ - very detailed Gantt project schedule

Comments:

< \$1/chip in production
 - designing in FPGA
 - production in ASIC?