**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)** |
| Overview  Score:\_\_\_\_\_\_ | * 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 |
| Coverage  Score:\_\_\_\_\_\_ | * 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 Frame  Score:\_\_\_\_\_\_ | * Presentation falls within required time frame | * NA | * Presentation exceeds maximum time (30 mins) | * Presentation less than minimum time (20 minutes) |
| Team Roles  Score:\_\_\_\_\_\_ | * 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 Feasibility  Score:\_\_\_ | * 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