

16.621 Oral Proposal Grading Sheet - Spring 2003

Performance Level (see reverse side for definitions)	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
Element						
Presentation quality						
Presenters maintain good eye contact with audience. Stance does not block audience view of screen						
Presenters use voice effectively. (volume, clarity, inflection, pace)						
Presenters poised and professional. (appearance, posture, gestures)						
Presenters uses visual aids well, do not read from notes or screens, stay within time limits						
Presenters handle questions, discussion, and any interruptions professionally, and balance responses between partners						
Technical content – Refer to proposal outline content in Appendix B of Syllabus						
Introduction: Background and significance; Brief overview of previous work: conceptual overview of experiment						
Hypothesis, Objective, Success Criteria						
Literature Review: Summarize previous work and why proposed study will add to the body of knowledge in this area						
Technical Approach: General description of entire project; description of apparatus and test articles: test matrices: errors						
Overall Evaluation						
Numerical Range	0-50	51-69	70-79	80-89	90-100	

Student: _____

Date: _____

Grader: _____

Grade: _____ /100

16.621 Oral Proposal Grading Sheet - Spring 2003

Performance Levels*

- 5 Exceptionally good** **Presentation quality:** Presentation skills** exceptionally good. Presentation has a clear, concise introduction and conclusion, is well organized to meet the needs of the audience, and is easy to follow.
Technical Content: Coverage and/or correctness of content demonstrates superior understanding of the subject matter, a foundation of extensive knowledge, an ability to skillfully use concepts, and an excellent conceptual design for a 16.62X project. The student is exceptionally well prepared to proceed to detailed design of experiment.
- 4 Good performance** **Presentation quality:** Presentation skills** good, with easy recovery from rough spots. Presentation has a clear, concise introduction and conclusion, is organized to meet the needs of the audience, and is generally easy to follow.
Technical Content: Coverage and/or correctness of content demonstrates a good understanding of the subject matter, capability for use of the relevant concepts, and a good conceptual design for a 16.62X project. The student is prepared to proceed to detailed design of the experiment.
- 3 Adequate** **Presentation quality:** Presentation skills** adequate, with some of rough spots. Presentation lacks a clear, concise introduction and/or conclusion, does not take into account the needs of the audience, and/or is difficult to follow.
Technical Content: Coverage and/or correctness of content demonstrates adequate understanding of the relevant material, an ability to apply the concepts in a relatively simple manner, and an adequate conceptual design for a 16.62X project. The student has the minimum preparation to proceed to detailed design of the experiment.
- 2 Minimally acceptable** **Presentation quality:** Presentation skills** inadequate, with many errors or rough spots. Presentation lacks a clear, concise introduction and/or conclusion, and is so disorganized that the audience must struggle to follow it and understand material.
Technical Content: Coverage and/or correctness of content demonstrates only partial familiarity with the subject matter, some capacity to work with the concepts in simple applications, and an incomplete conceptual design for a 16.62X project. Deficiencies are serious enough that the student should make major revisions before proceeding to a detailed design of the experiment.
- 1 Unacceptable** **Presentation Quality:** Presentation is flawed to such an extent that it can't convey information in a useful way.
Technical Content: Content is missing, so incomplete, or so full of errors that it does not satisfy minimum requirements of acceptability. The student must redo the conceptual design of the experiment before proceeding to detailed design.

?? These performance levels are paraphrased from the definition of MIT grades given in the MIT Bulletin.

?? ** Listed in rows on other side.