Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Ryan Patton\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Group being evaluated \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_1\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

This form is for evaluating the final project presentations made by the groups you are not a member of. Please provide comments on each group presentation on a separate sheet. All useful comments will be considered, but any inappropriate (vulgar or abusive) comments will be disregarded.

Please keep in mind, this evaluation is part of your final presentation grade!

Some of the key points that should be covered in these final presentations are:

1. Conceptual Design: very well thought out and seemed to have the most solidified system. I was extremely impressed with all of the technical detail they provided describing their system.
2. Requirements: no comment
3. Analysis of Alternatives: Seemed adequate. I would have liked to have heard more on how they decided on using ANSYS.
4. Functional Analysis: good job.
5. System Physical Architecture: I don’t recall actually seeing an architecture but it could have been there
6. Risk Assessment: no comment
7. Cost and Schedule: Ambitious and costs seemed low but no more or less reasonable than the other groups
8. Professional Appearance: slides all looked good. Good overview
9. Other comments: Best technical detail on their system. Seemed to lack some Systems Engineering process graphs and material in their presentation but I was more impressed with the amount of progress they had made on their system. I’ve used ANSYS before but I thought it was interesting they were incorporating it for their system which to me in my limited knowledge sounded a little unconventional. I would personally give it a 9.7/10 but if we’re focusing on the Systems Engineering process it would probably bring it down to a 9.2-9.5 if I was grading.

Group being evaluated \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_2\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

This form is for evaluating the final project presentations made by the groups you are not a member of. Please provide comments on each group presentation on a separate sheet. All useful comments will be considered, but any inappropriate (vulgar or abusive) comments will be disregarded.

Please keep in mind, this evaluation is part of your final presentation grade!

Some of the key points that should be covered in these final presentations are:

Comments: This was our own group’s presentation so I don’t think I evaluate it. I thought we did a decent job of describing our system and providing enough technical details. After watching them all, I thought group 1 exceeded us on a strategy to implement their system. I’m trying to grade objectively but I think we did the second best job of thinking through what it would be like to actually implement the system. Group 4 had the best Systems Engineering graphs and procedures outlined in their presentation but I think we could arguably be 2nd or 3rd for this. I would probably give us a 9.0-9.4/10. I personally liked that we avoided droning on about some of the more technical Systems Engineering details laid out on the screen and did a good job of describing unique aspects of the system while avoiding reading off the slides. In a more serious presentation where we would actually be vying to win a big contract, I would have done less of a job outlining some Systems Engineering graphs as part of the process and provided more enticing numbers that the customer would surely zero in on.

Group being evaluated \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_3\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

This form is for evaluating the final project presentations made by the groups you are not a member of. Please provide comments on each group presentation on a separate sheet. All useful comments will be considered, but any inappropriate (vulgar or abusive) comments will be disregarded.

Please keep in mind, this evaluation is part of your final presentation grade!

Some of the key points that should be covered in these final presentations are:

1. Conceptual Design: idea was similar to ours so I feel more comfortable critiquing it. I realize it’s a one semester course where it’s hard to come up with time to think of innovative ideas but I don’t see big picture anything new the system would contribute. Our system’s idea was to incorporate many different forms of idea into one central data collection and feed the data into a hopefully innovative algorithm. Their idea from the presentation I gathered was to utilize SOSUS network and contribute a machine learning algorithm. Without any suggestions to back what would be innovative about their machine learning algorithm I’m left wondering how it would be planned to actually execute the plan and what the plan contributes. I kept thinking that surely SOSUS has thought of such an idea before if not already trying to execute it. I’m really not trying to judge too harsh as our plan isn’t perfect either at this stage but to me I thought their presentation seemed like a way to provide just enough idea of a system without actually trying to define a system they would be committing to other than working in collaboration with SOSUS. It seemed like they were utilizing buzzwords without a technical understanding of what it would take to implement the system.
2. Requirements: Requirements seemed a little too general for me
3. Analysis of Alternatives: I don’t recall seeing anything about alternative analysis.
4. Functional Analysis: no comment
5. System Physical Architecture: I didn’t see an architecture, may have overlooked
6. Risk Assessment: they had the risk assessment slide with the cube. Spent ample time talking about the risk assessments but it would have been nice having something to see on the screen describing the risks.
7. Cost and Schedule: schedule was reasonable but ambitious. Probably less trouble than our own groups and others implementing their system considering its simple use with SOSUS
8. Professional Appearance: they used the MST’s standard background on their PowerPoint which I liked. Didn’t have too many slides. Their graphs on their TPMs showed trends to reduce error overtime which is a good idea but I’m not sure where that data was coming from to get those trends to match well.
9. Other comments: To be honest it was hard not comparing their system to ours. I thought we did a considerably better job going into more detail and touching on more aspects of what it would take to actually implement the system. I would give it around 8.5-9.0/10

Group being evaluated \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_4\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

This form is for evaluating the final project presentations made by the groups you are not a member of. Please provide comments on each group presentation on a separate sheet. All useful comments will be considered, but any inappropriate (vulgar or abusive) comments will be disregarded.

Please keep in mind, this evaluation is part of your final presentation grade!

Some of the key points that should be covered in these final presentations are:

1. Conceptual Design: Definitive plan in place. Only question I remember having was they said they were going to deploy 80 sensors but I don’t remember them narrowing it down to a particular area. If they’re working with the USGS I would assume the United States west coast but I don’t remember hearing this (could be wrong). I still think 80 sensors seemed ambitious and a little impractical but I’m not a SME on seismic predictions so far all I know it could be a good plan.
2. Requirements: They didn’t seem to have too many requirements but their requirements did seem to hit all of the major areas it should.
3. Analysis of Alternatives: The 3 breakdown comparisons they had on the one side was a very nice touch because it was easy for me to see the big comparisons they were talking about while they were explaining it
4. Functional Analysis: Don’t have any major comments on this. Did a good job.
5. System Physical Architecture: They had level-1, level-2, and level-3 architectures which was pretty impressive. They went through explaining them pretty well but I thought they may have spent a little too much time going through them considering they’re more thought-provoking, visual representations of how the system will work.
6. Risk Assessment: Their graphs seemed fine. I like that they had a slide to explain their major risk assessments in addition to just the graph.
7. Cost and Schedule: I thought their schedule seemed highly ambitious given that it went to around 2021 or 2022 and they were trying to deploy 80 sensors but given that our schedule isn’t perfect either it’s hard to critique too much.
8. Professional Appearance: Looked very professional. Their use of the MST generic Powerpoint background was a nice touch.
9. Other comments: very good powerpoint presentation. 9.5/10 if I was grading. Applied clean appropriate graphs and explained them well without going overboard on the explanations. Timing was almost perfect.