

Technical Presentations - Rubric

Describe the overall architecture of your project. Start with a brief overview of the system goals, then give a technical description of what the key components are, what types of technologies/libraries you will make use of, and how the pieces will interact and the technical challenges (and risks). Conclude with your plan/proposal for your alpha prototype.

Think of your technical presentation as a working draft that you will keep iterating on (and adding to) throughout the duration of the project – each subsequent presentation will be an iteration on this presentation (except the final one which will include a 2 minute elevator pitch aspect followed by the tech presentation). So, the first tech presentation slides will be the starting point for your next presentation.

Time: You have 6 minutes for your presentation, with up to an additional minute to describe your plans for alpha release demo (you can choose to cover this after your tech presentation). You should plan on a maximum of one minute to summarize your idea, and then move to the technical description. The technical description should include the system architecture diagram and the technical tasks of each team member must be clearly conveyed during the presentation.

Scoring: 4=Excellent, 3=Good, 2=Acceptable, 1=Poor

Categories: Oral Communication and Technical Content. The grade will give more weight to the technical content.

Metrics (scoring) category by individual and team::

Individual:

- 1) Eye contact, body language, poise:
- 2) Energy, Enthusiasm, and Speaking Skills:

Group:

- 3) Organization and Length (including visuals and slides)
- 4) Description of Subject Matter
- 5) Technical Scope relative to team size
- 6) Evaluation of the Alpha Prototype

Oral Communication Skills Metrics (same as presentation 1 scoring levels - check the rubric posted earlier)

- Eye Contact (looking at slides included)
- Body language and Poise
- Energy and Enthusiasm
- Speaking skills

Technical Content

Metric	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Poor
Organization, Slides	Similar to Presentation 1: logical and interesting sequence, excellent visuals	Similar to Presentation 1: well organized, good flow most of the time, appropriate visuals	Similar to Presentation 1: poor flow of topics, visuals not put in context	Similar to presentation 1: Audience cannot understand presentation poor flow&visuals/slides
Subject Matter (System arch., tech description, key components)	Excellent discussion of overall architecture. Correct assessment of key technical challenges, with demonstrated understanding of how to address them.	Discussion of overall architecture with some uneven balance and little consistency. Identification of some key technical challenges and understanding of them.	Incomplete system design or not clearly integrated. Lack of awareness or plan to address some key technical challenges.	technical plans of of project unclear. , No apparent understanding of key technical challenges.
Technical Scope, Innovation and Tech Challenges; Design feasibility (tech, libraries, components interaction etc.)	Project scope is ambitious and exceeds criteria. Has novel tech features. Good discussion of design feasibility	Project scope meets criteria. Has some novel technical features. Some discussion of design feasibility	Project scope should be extended with 1-2 features to meet criteria. Tech. challenge just meets criteria. Little discussion of design feasibility.	Project scope must be extended substantially to meet project criteria. Technical innovation and challenges not sufficient. No discussion of design feasibility.
Team workload	Technical Content and challenge justifies team size. Each responsible for technically challenging component.	Technical Content and challenge sometimes justifies team size. Some team members have technically challenging component.	Technical Content and challenge does not completely justify team size. team members do not have tech. challenging components.	Serious concerns with equitable workload and technical challenge/depth amongst team members. Scope must be increased.
Alpha Prototype	Prototype meets criteria. Detailed plan, with thorough feasibility study and preliminary implementation	Meets criteria. Detailed plan, with thorough feasibility study. No current implementation.	Provided outline of plan to meet criteria. Concerns with how project will ramp up to meet the final demo in	Does not meet criteria – insufficient progress for an alpha release. Concerns with how final product will meet criteria.

			remaining time.	
--	--	--	-----------------	--