

Wyatt Hopper

35085629

Project 12 Feedback

This is a written evaluation for Team 12, which was the heat exchanger recovery device. Starting with the content section I gave them a grade of 4/4 and the reason I did this is because they managed to explain all the information clearly to the audience and there was no confusion when it came to the explanations for the project. On top of this there were no conceptual errors that distracted from the overall presentation all the information they presented made sense together. The only constructive criticism I have is that there was a repeat of information during the discussion of the decision matrix which created some confusion in the report. To resolve this issue, I would recommend studying the presentation and remembering the information on one's slide so that mistakes like this do not happen. Moving onto the next criteria which is organization I gave the group a 4/4 and the reasoning for this is the information was presented in a fashion and sequence that is well understood by the audience and in addition to this none of the content was missing. I will say the only thing I would improve on is trying to not speed slides along or explain slides that aren't present as this was seen in the presentation caused some unnecessary confusion. One way one can prevent this is by changing slides as one speaks and memorizing what is on each slide. Moving onto the next criteria known as presentation I gave them a 3.8/4 and the reason I did this was because they did have a great volume for their presentation, enunciation was great throughout the presentation, and they explained a lot of their visuals which enhanced their presentation overall. However, a few criticisms that I have for the presentation are that not all of the visuals were readable which created confusion, there were some pauses during the presentation, and there were some pictures that weren't explained during the presentation which created some confusion. To improve this, I would run through the presentation on a projector and fix the visuals that are blurry or are hard to read to not pause as often think about what you are going to say before it leaves one's mouth and explain all the visuals you have before moving onto the next slide. The final criteria were the Q/A session and for this I gave a 4/4 for the fact that they answered all questions the audience had to the fullest extent and managed to explain answers in a way the audience understood. I have no constructive criticism for this section as they did phenomenally in it, but all in all this is the grades that I give for Project 12.

Project #: 12

Title: Heat Exchanger Recovery

Evaluator: Wyatt + Hopper

| | |
|-----------|---|
| Outcome 3 | An ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences |
| Assessed | Final Presentation MECH 446 – Senior Design Capstone Project – Honors Requirement |

| | | Level of Achievement | | | | Score |
|--|------------------|---|---|--|---|------------------------|
| | | Exemplary (Score: 4) | Proficient (Score: 3) | Apprentice (Score: 2) | Novice (Score: 1) | |
| Performance Indicator | 1. Content. | Information is clearly conveyed to the audience. New concepts fully explained. | Information is sufficiently conveyed to the audience. Minor conceptual errors do not distract from overall impact. | Some information conveyed to audience. Some conceptual errors distracted from overall message. | Little information conveyed to audience. Major conceptual errors confused audience undermined credibility. | 4 |
| | 2. Organization. | Sequence of information made sense and was easy to follow. | Sequence of information mostly made sense and was easy to follow. | Communication to audience was affected negatively by improper sequence or missing content. | Lack of proper organization resulting in audience struggling to follow along. | 4 |
| | 3. Presentation. | Pace, volume, and enunciation excellent to very effectively convey the information. Quality of presentation (e.g., visual aids) adds to the audience's understanding. | Pace, volume, and enunciation sufficient to convey information. Quality of presentation (e.g., visual aids) do not detract from the audience's understanding. | Pace, volume, or enunciation off enough to distract from content. Quality of presentation (e.g., visual aids) detracts slightly from the audience's understanding. | Pace, volume, or enunciation off enough to distract from entire presentation. Quality of presentation (e.g., visual aids) significantly detracts from the audience's understanding. | 3.8 |
| | 4. Q/A Session. | Questions from audience answered correctly and confidently to successfully help audience understand. | Questions from audience answered adequately. | Either questions were not answered correctly and adequately or the speaker was a little uncertain or hesitant. | Either the speaker cannot answer questions or is very uncomfortable. | 4 |
| Additional Comments: voice is elevated enough to hear, uses uh, a lot, constant pausing, info. is clearly conveyed & made easy to understand for audience, simplified explanation for audience | | | | | | Average Score: 3.95 |

Explains how to stay in contact with key people

Two of the design concepts was hard to read.

Repeated a factor in decision matrix creating confusion.

Didn't explain picture on the right when talking about tanks.

Timeline hard to read, describes key dates + problems, & corrections made to schedule.

Explains pictures of actual components.

Key equations hard to read.

Explains next steps for next semester

Explains the connections between them & the sponsors & why there were problems in the schedule.

Finished within time answered all questions that the audience had.

Organized in a way that is easily understandable