CSC Engineering Technical Presentation Rubric

University Team Name:_____ Team Number:_____

Score the following categories on a 0-10 point scale, ranging from inadequate to excellent, using only whole numbers. Each category will be weighted in the final points awarded according to the percent value in the weight and category column. The following criteria are a general guideline for awarding points. Rationale **MUST** be given to explain point deductions.

Category and Weight	**10**	**5**	**0**	**Score (0-10)**	**Notes/ Rationale**
Initial Project Selection (15%)	● Goals are well established ● Projects clearly align with goals ● Timeline is presented, reasonable, and developed	● Goals are presented but somewhat unclear ● Projects mostly align with goals ● Timeline is presented but could use more development	● No goals are established ● Selected projects are undefined ● No timeline or timeline is undeveloped/vague		
Background, Research, and Simulation (10%)	● Effective use of research and simulation ● Clear understanding of how the project affects other systems ● Research and simulation are relevant to goals	● Research and simulation is used, but purpose is not clear ● Some discussion on how the project affects other systems ● Team mostly understands the research completed	● No understanding of changes being made ● No research or simulation ● No discussion on project impact to other systems		
Prototyping (5%)	● Effective use of prototyping ● Discussion on how the prototypes influenced the engineering process and final design	● Prototypes are made but need more evaluation ● Missing some discussion on how the prototype influenced the final design	● No evidence of prototyping ● No discussion on the engineering design process		
Implementation (10%)	● Clear explanation of changes and their purpose ● Team understands the implementation process for the project	● Mostly clear how the project will be implemented but may be missing key elements or ideas	● No explanation of how the project components will be implemented or team did not understand how they would implement the project		

Testing Methodology (20%)	● Well defined testing procedure and assumptions ● Team understood their procedures and assumptions ● Clear understanding of how data is interpreted ● Baseline performance is taken and relevant to the final testing.	● Test procedure and assumptions are developed but may miss some key ideas ● Data interpretation is mostly sound, but with minor issues ● Baseline measurement was taken, but with minor issues	● Team does not define test procedure, assumptions, or baseline measurements. ● Team does not understand how to interpret their data		
Data Analysis & Results (25%)	● Analysis and findings (successful or not) clearly defined and presented ● Project(s) impact on one or more of the pillars of the competition were clearly presented	● Analysis and findings were somewhat outlined ● Project(s) impact was touched on, but not in great detail	● No analysis or findings (successful or not) were presented ● Project impact was neglected		
Presentation Skills (5%)	● Team is professional and well prepared ● Presentation flows well and is of professional quality (style, grammar, spelling, etc.)	● Team is professional and mostly prepared ● Presentation has minor flow and quality issues.	● Team is not professional or prepared ● Presentation has major flow and quality issues		
Defense (10%)*	● Team is capable of answering questions resolutely and defended their decisions ● Valid reasons for project selection, test methods, and data analysis were provided	● Team answered some questions and partially defended decisions ● Some reasons were provided for projects, test, and data analysis	● Team was not able to defend decisions nor answer questions ● No valid reasons were provided for project selection, test methods, or data analysis		

*It is crucial for judge's to ask questions during the presentation and give the team an opportunity to defend their design. If no questions are asked, the team should be awarded a 10.