

EE486 Design Review 4 Presentation

RUBRIC

General Information

- *Grading:* Team AND individual level (n team members).

$$\text{Team} = (\text{Intro.} + \frac{\sum (\text{WBS}_n)}{n} + \text{Demo.} + \text{Concl.}) \times 1 =$$

Introduction:

Graded As:	Poor (0)	Average (5)	Exceptional (10)
Explanation:	Team is not introduced. Slide is missing, or skipped.	Team is introduced, but audience cannot understand or hear the team member introductions.	Team is introduced clearly and loudly; understood by all audience members.
Notes: <u>Grade</u>			

WBS 1:

Graded As:	Poor (0)	Average (25)	Exceptional (40 - 50)
Explanation:	No WBS and thus no analysis of WBS status.	Includes an informal update of status, but without an analysis of how close to the original specification this activity/task is.	Includes an objective (not subjective) analysis of the status of this activity/task. This is done within the context of client requirements.
Notes: <u>Grade</u>			

WBS 2:

Graded As:	Poor (0)	Average (25)	Exceptional (40 - 50)
Explanation:	No WBS and thus no analysis of WBS status.	Includes an informal update of status, but without an analysis of how close to the original specification this activity/task is.	Includes an objective (not subjective) analysis of the status of this activity/task. This is done within the context of client requirements.
Notes: <u>Grade</u>			

WBS 3:

Graded As:	Poor (0)	Average (25)	Exceptional (40 - 50)
Explanation:	No WBS and thus no analysis of WBS status.	Includes an informal update of status, but without an analysis of how close to the original specification this activity/task is.	Includes an objective (not subjective) analysis of the status of this activity/task. This is done within the context of client requirements.
Notes: <u>Grade</u>			

WBS 4:

Graded As:	Poor (0)	Average (25)	Exceptional (40 - 50)
Explanation:	No WBS and thus no analysis of WBS status.	Includes an informal update of status, but without an analysis of how close to the original specification this activity/task is.	Includes an objective (not subjective) analysis of the status of this activity/task. This is done within the context of client requirements.
Notes: <u>Grade</u>			

Demonstration:

Graded As:	Poor (0)	Average (15)	Exceptional (25 - 30)
Explanation:	No demonstration, live or in video, is provided.	A demonstration is provided, but it does not clearly demonstrate a metric from the original WBS(s) the team had developed.	The demonstration clearly addresses both the activity of the WBS(s), client requirements, and relative importance of this feature.
Notes: <u>Grade</u>			

Conclusion/Closing:

Graded As:	Poor (0)	Average (5)	Exceptional (10)
Explanation:	Conclusion slide is missing or skipped.	The conclusion doesn't actually conclude the presentation, wrapping together previous slides. Or is copy-paste of Overview.	The conclusion wraps up all previous slides, "weaving them into a story" that makes the big picture obvious.
Notes: <u>Grade</u>			

Individual Student Assessments:

Student Name	Clarity Is it easy to understand what the student is discussing, and why?	Professionalism Did the student dress and act professionally? And their mannerisms/speech?	Scope Were all aspects covered in sufficient detail? Did they fit into the bigger picture?