

Class Presentation Evaluation Sheet

1. Comments

Team Id: _____ Project Title: _____

Team members participating: 1 2 3 4 5 6 Date _____

Characteristic	Comments
1. Motivation for the research: All aspects of current business practice, organisational factors, business pressures and constraints, database or computer facilities, or documentation that have contributed to the problem being addressed. There should be sufficient detail for the problem to become obvious.	
2. Problem Definition: Expressed clearly and succinctly. Stated as a problem. Does not anticipate the solution. Not critical of client.	
3. Objectives: Enumerated. Expressed clearly and in a form that is testable.	
4. Methodology: Clear description of what was done and how it was done. Specific mention of the kind of data collected and the way in which it was collected. Some evaluation of the success of the methodology and suggestions for improvement.	
5. Selected screens/output from prototype: (optional) one or two screen shots to explain the function of crucial data entry screens of the prototype or online survey.	
6. Data/Information collected and treatment of data: A brief description of the data collected during the research. Discusses whether qualitative or quantitative, volume of data obtained, how stored, quality (reliability and accuracy) of the data. If of poor quality explanation and suggestions for improvement. How the data was treated and how the results influenced the conclusions reached.	
7. Summary of findings and recommendations Brief restatement of the problem, extent to which each of the objectives was achieved. Recommendations suggesting how client might proceed to deal with the problem specified, making use of the research.	
8. Overall presentation: Timing within the 15 minutes allotted. Presentation is logically structured, well delivered and interesting. All of the team involved. Appropriate colours and fonts used on slides. All presenters speak fluently and can be easily heard.	

Class Presentation Evaluation Sheet

2. Assessment

Ring the most appropriate mark below. Add a general comment if desired.

Assessment	Mark	
<i>Faultless presentation of professional standard:</i> Describes factors that have contributed to the problem being addressed. Sufficient detail for the problem to become obvious. Stated problem succinctly. Expressed objectives testable form. Clear description of what was done and how. Evaluation of methodology with suggestions for improvement. One or two screen shots of the prototype (optional). Description of the data collected: whether qualitative or quantitative, volume, quality. Suggestions for improvement. How treated. Summary of extent to which objectives were achieved. Recommendations how client might proceed to deal with the problem. Timing within the 15 minutes allotted. Presentation well structured, well delivered and interesting. All of the team involved. Appropriate colours and fonts used on slides. All presenters speak fluently and can be easily heard.	10	
<i>An outstanding presentation:</i> Would be acceptable to any professional. Compelling and instructive. Well structured and delivered. Little room for improvement.	9	
<i>Very proficient presentation:</i> One area needs improvement, e.g. faults in expression, motivation not made clear, problem definition not clear, methodology not clear, treatment of data lacking, unfortunate choice of colour or font, one speaker was not fluent.	8	
<i>Proficient presentation:</i> Two features needing improvement e.g. one member of team not involved, less than effective motivation, problem definition not clear, unfortunate choice of colour or font, one speaker could not be heard	7	
<i>Clear pass but only just:</i> All the major features are present but barely adequate, e.g. problem definition not good, description of motivation hazy, layout of slides not well thought out, little insight evident, or conclusion weak.	6	
<i>Less than adequate:</i> Several features barely adequate, e.g. problem definition weak, description of business context weak, layout of slides weak, little insight evident, conclusion weak.	5	4
<i>Very weak:</i> Many features barely adequate, e.g. problem definition poor, description of business context poor, layout of slides poor, little insight evident, conclusion poor.	3	2
<i>Totally inadequate:</i> Multiple major omission or weakness: motivation and/or objectives and/or methodology and/or slide presentation	1	0