**Design Review 2:**

**Presentation Evaluation**

Qualitative review of presentations to provide constructive feedback

Presenting Team:

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date of Review: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Presentation being reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**PART I: The Presentation Content** (we’ll get to video tech and delivery later):

**A: Problem Statement:** How did the team do on this critical first leg of the talk?

* Did the talk: Clearly describe the project?
* Make it clear why this project is important by connecting it to its real-world importance/impact?
* Did the intro move smoothly from big picture to what the client does to what the client’s problem challenge is generally; to what specific problems the client has?

**B). Solution Overview:** Did the talk then make it clear what they are building and why/how it solves the problems outlined in the last step? Did the talk:

* Say what exactly is being built: a web app, a mobile app, a linux package, etc.
* Give you a good solid idea of what their solution looks like and what its overall approach to solving the problem is?
* Go through and highlight the key features, convincing that they directly solve the client’s needs outlined before.

**C. The MAIN BODY of the talk:** Hopefully the presentation team has you clear on the project and it’s motivation and fully hooked on their cool solution concept. Now it’s time for them to give you the detail. Exactly what goes in this BODY section depends on the focus of the DR: for DR2, we are focused on describing the software design and architecture that resulted from your design process, ending with some discussion of coding progress. How did talk do with this flow:

* Review the key requirements driving the project. This is typically a one-slide condensation of the key requirements they developed last term, with verbal content smoothly reminding us of how requirements were acquired and what the highlights are.
* Review the overall architecture of their solution, including a review and brief justification of the technologies that they used.
* THE MEAT: The presentation should now dig more into the design details. This might start with a big UML diagram to give an overview of the end result, but should then dig into only one or two modules just to give you a taste of what the completed design looks like at the lowest level. They could then refer listeners to the written doc for full details on all modules. The key question: Did you come away feeling that their *design process* was orderly and complete, and that the resulting design appears robust and solid.
* Review some challenges they faced and how they solved them? In this stage of the design process, you’d expect to hear about challenges related to coding and implementation.
* Review their project development timeline. The idea is to orient you in the process as a whole, and give you a clear sense of where the team is on the key tasks. You should get a quick but clear impression of the main tasks, as well as future upcoming tasks. Do you get a clear sense that they are ahead/on-time/slipping?

**D. The cherry on the cake: How was the conclusion?** Did it leave you feeling impressed and satisfied? Specifically, did the talk:

* Loop back in the conclusion to remind you of the big picture importance of the problem/project: motivations, the key problems the client had and the key product features that address them?
* Review the highlights of this particular DR: Review what they’ve accomplished in the design phase (problems solved, UML specs produced, etc.) and where they are now, i.e., how’s the coding coming along.
* Nice to end with getting back to the client: how has the client been involved, are they happy with progress, etc. End by saying something like “we hope to show you the completed prototype in a few weeks”, i.e., positive ending.

**PART II: The Presentation DELIVERY**

We’ve talked about content completeness and flow. But how was the delivery in this new video format? Did the team rise to the challenge? This is where you can really help the team with their video technique and technologies.

**A: The Basics:**  Start by just rating each of the following on a scale of 5(best) to (1) worst. Plus give 1-2 sentences to explain the rating.

* Visibility of slide content
* Quality of speaker audio (clarity, volume, etc.)
* Visibility of the speaker, if/when images of speaker were integrated. To what extent was the speaker visible (resolution, size, placement of image). Give a ‘1’ if no speaker images were integrated.
* Quality of transitions between speakers and/or parts of the talk.

**B: Recommendations for improvement.**  Briefly comment on specific technical items or areas where you feel the team could focus to make their video presentation feel more smooth and professional. Remember, we’re focusing on delivery here, not content. Try to give at least two specific recommendations that you feel would most help.

**C: Evaluative Estimations:**  Think about the presentation again. As a summary of all your comments, what grade would you give the team on this attempt? Score using A-F, with +/- on any grade allowed. Note that you are not giving “THE grade” (their team mentor does that), you’re just giving an overall indication of how you’d rate it.

* Grade for Slides, Flow, and Content (Part 1): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Grade for Technical Video Presentation (Part 2): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

OVERALL, we’d give this presentation a: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Instructions: Use this document as a template for preparing your review.**

1. Start by filling in the header info: team being reviewed, your team, what presentation this is, and date.
2. After watching the presentation video, go through and fill in comments in the section above. **Use a different color for your comments**, to clearly distinguish your comments from template text.
3. Try to be thoughtful, specific, and constructive about your comments. Something like “kind of weak, could use improvement” is not helpful. Be specific. Your reviews will be graded on thoughtfulness, completeness and quality of advice.
4. When you are done, save this document as a PDF, and mail to both the team leader and to \*your\* team mentor (not the mentor of the reviewed team!).