

Wyatt Hopper

35085629

Project 17 Feedback

This is a written evaluation for Team 17 which was the lift design for cots into emergency vans. 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. In addition to this there were no conceptual errors, and everything aligned logically. There are not any constructive criticisms that I have for this project as they did a phenomenal job in this criteria. Moving onto the organization criteria I gave them a 4/4 and the reason I did this was the way they presented the information was in a way that was easily understood by the audience and the sequence of information was not confusing and was highly logical. Again, for this section I have no constructive criticism they did an excellent job presenting the information they had. Moving onto the presentation criteria I gave them a 3.9/4 and the reason I did this was because their voice and enunciation was perfect throughout the presentation and a lot of the visual aids enhanced the presentation. However, there were some visual aids I could not read at a distance which distracted me from the presentation. To resolve this issue, I would run the presentation through a projector and view it at a distance and fix any of the visual aids that could not be read very easily. Moving onto the final criteria, which is the Q/A session, this team did a phenomenal job answering all the questions that the audience had and explained answers in a way that the audience could understand. Again, I have no constructive criticisms for this section for this project as they did a phenomenal job, but all in all this is the grades I gave for project 17.

Project #: 17

Title: Lift design for cots into Emergency Van
 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. | 3.9 |
| | 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: | | | | | Average Score: | |
| <p>volume is excellent, slides are readable, explanation is internal audience can understand, concept hard to read at distance, information is clearly conveyed, no use of Uh, Decision matrix somewhat hard to read. Information goes in a sequential order that is well understood.</p> | | | | | 3.475 | |

Visual Aids enhance explanation of project
 Discuss further plans for project.
 Pauses in explanation, brief.
 Timeline hard to read
 Had time for questions & answered them effectively.