**MECE 4362 Senior Design II – Final Oral Presentation Rubric: Non-Technical**

**Team Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation****Component** | **3 – Expert** **(10 points for each area)** | **2 – Proficient****(8 points for each area)** | **1 – Apprentice****(6 points for each area)** | **0 – Novice****(4 points for each area)** |
| OverviewScore:\_\_\_\_\_\_ | * Confident introduction of roles and contribution
* Clear purpose, overview, background, and agenda
 | * Confident introduction of roles and contribution
* Clear purpose, overview, background, and agenda but could be better
 | * Introduction of roles and contribution awkward
* Sketchy or unclear purpose, overview, background, and agenda

 | * No introduction or overview, background, or agenda

 |
| CoverageScore:\_\_\_\_\_\_ | * Addresses all specified content areas including situation introduction, problem formulation, concept generation, concept selection, and embodiment design.
* Sufficient discussion through concept selection with excellent focus on detailed design.
 | * Addresses most content areas including situation introduction, problem formulation, concept generation, concept selection, and embodiment design.
* Sufficient discussion through concept selection with sufficient focus on detailed design.

 | * Addresses some of the content areas including situation introduction, problem formulation, concept generation, concept selection, and embodiment design.
* Insufficient discussion through concept selection with sufficient focus on detailed design.
 | * Addresses few of the content areas including situation introduction, problem formulation, concept generation, concept selection, and embodiment design.
* Insufficient discussion through concept selection with insufficient focus on detailed design.
 |
| Presentation Skills(Clarity)Score:\_\_\_\_\_\_ | * Clearly heard and polished.
* Attitude indicates confidence and enthusiasm.
* Audience attention is constantly maintained.
 | * Clearly heard but not polished.
* Attitude indicates confidence but not enthusiasm
* Audience attention is mostly maintained.
 | * Difficult to hear and/or moments of awkwardness.
* Attitude indicates lack of confidence or disinterest in a subject.
* Audience attention is minimally maintained.
 | * Inaudible; several awkward pauses.
* Attitude indicates lack of confidence and/or disinterest in subject.
* Audience attention is not maintained.
 |
| Visuals(Graphics)Score:\_\_\_\_\_\_ | * Text is easily readable
* Graphics use constantly supports the presentation.
* Slide composition has a professional look that enhances the presentation.
 | * Text is readable.
* Graphics used mostly supports the presentation.
* Slide composition is not visually appealing, but does not detract from the presentation.
 | * Text is readable with effort.
* Graphics use rarely support the presentation.
* Slide composition sometimes distracts from the presentation.
 | * Text is not readable.
* Graphics does not support the presentation.
* Slide composition format is clearly distracting, obscuring the presentation.
 |
| Organization(Flow)Score:\_\_\_\_\_\_ | * Information presented in logical and interesting sequence that the audience can easily follow.
 | * Information presented in a logical sequence that the audience can easily follow.
 | * Information is not always presented in a logical sequence; audience has difficulty following presentation.

 | * Information not presented in a logical sequence; audience cannot understand presentation.
 |
| Time FrameScore:\_\_\_\_\_\_ | * Presentation falls within required time frame

 | * NA

 | * Presentation exceeds maximum time (30 mins)

 | * Presentation less than minimum time (20 minutes)
 |
| Team RolesScore:\_\_\_\_\_\_ | * Clear roles
* Balanced contribution
* Good transition between presenters
* Cross reference each other
 | * Clear roles
* Equal contribution

 | * Clear roles
* Unequal contribution

 | * Unclear roles

 |
| Ethics, Safety, Professional Responsibility, & Societal Ramifications Score:\_\_\_\_\_\_ | * **All** areas addressed
* Clearly considered and/or met professional and/or ethical standards involved
* Recognized and clearly considered the societal impact of their solution
 | * **Most** areas addressed

 | * **Some** areas addressed

 | * Few areas addressed or not considered

 |
| Product FeasibilityScore:\_\_\_ | * Feasibility Analysis
* Cost Analysis
* Market Size & Competitions
 | * **Most areas addressed**
 | * **Some areas addressed**
 | * Few or none considered
 |
| Handling of Questions(Q&A)Score:\_\_\_\_\_\_ | * Demonstrates full knowledge of the material; can explain and elaborate on expected questions.
 | * Demonstrates sufficient knowledge of the material to answer expected questions.
 | * Demonstrates difficulty answering expected questions beyond a rudimentary level.

 | * Demonstrates an inability to answer expected questions.
 |

Reviewer Signature\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Content adapted from “Using Rubrics for the Assessment of Senior Design Projects”, J. K. Estell and J. Hurtig, Proc of the ASEE Conference, 2006