

Biomedical Engineering Junior Presentation Evaluation Criteria
Dr. C. S. Tritt, Version 1.0, September 2008

Team:

Score:

Date:

Content – Quality of Presentation				
High school level or below. No slides. No sources cited. Sloppy, unprofessional personal appearance.	Poor slides. Inarticulate. Poor sources. Ambiguous goal.	A few shortcomings. Reasonable statement of goal. Block diagram & sketches provided.	Impressive slides. Articulate speech. Reasonable sources. Professional personal appearance.	Excellent slides. Engaging presentation. Goal clearly articulated.

Comments:

Content – Quantity of Effort & Progress				
What have you been doing the past 2 years? Lost in the wilderness.	Significantly less than expected effort. Large gaps in reported effort. Little progress, significantly off track.	Slightly less than expected effort. Slightly less than expected progress.	Steady and appropriate amount of effort. On track, made expected progress. Well supported recommendation.	More effort and/or time than expected. Progress exceeds expectations.

Comments:

Market Evaluation – Identifying and addressing customer needs and competitive or alternative products.				
No potential customers described. No competitive or alternative products identified.	Inadequate customer and competitive product identification and consideration.	Good attempt made to identify customers and their needs. Good attempt made to identify competitive or alternative products.	Customers identified and needs reasonably accessed. Competitive or alternative products reasonably accessed.	Customers identified and needs well accessed. Competitive or alternative products well accessed.

Comments:

Evaluation of Regulatory, Standards, Ethical and Social Aspects				
No apparent attempt made to identify applicable regulatory, standards, ethical or social issues.	Inadequate identification of applicable regulatory, standards, ethical or social issues.	Reasonable attempt made to identify applicable regulatory, standards, ethical or social issues.	Identified regulatory, standards, ethical and social issues considered in project plans.	Regulatory, standards, ethical and social context clearly identified and fully addressed.

Comments:

Technical Evaluation				
No technical approach described.	Inappropriate technical approach. Errors in logic.	Reasonable, if incomplete, technical approach.	Two or more reasonable technical approaches described.	Complete, accurate, creative and insightful thinking regarding technologies.

Comments:

Recommendation, Plan, Schedule and Assignment of Duties (Responsibilities)				
No clear recommendation made. No plan, schedule or assignments described.	Inadequate plan and schedule for future work presented. Only vague assignments described.	Reasonable recommendation made. An attempt made to plan and schedule future work. Some assignments described.	Reasonable plans and schedule for future work described. Assignments reasonably described.	Well considered recommendation made. Clear and complete plans and schedule for future work described. Assignments clearly and completely described.

Comments:

Overall comments: