

Name: Section 11 Section: _____ Date: _____

11 1pm

- Content
1. Audience Appropriateness
 2. Technical Details
 3. Visual Aids
 4. Creative
- Delivery
1. Structure
 2. Verbal Communication
 3. Non-Verbal Communication
 4. Impact

X = Weak + = Strong

Speaker	Content				Delivery				Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Jacoby	1	-	-		1	-		4	no link for cups - why? pages 4mm; rising with film; msft visual; evolution no name on slide;
Robby	+	+	-		+	-	+		has this speech
Milde		+	+		+	+	+		explaining outcome in questions.
JFF			+		+	+	+		soft voice initially; jargon prominent; --'s class & gave some graph didn't display; students understood it; nice visuals; kept fingers' part pocket;
Yu-Ling								+	lots of eye movement in velocity; handwriting; content not staying; read notes; final word used twice with slides; polysyllabic; cycles - on-off?
Ding		X							
Antoine									
Caprice	+	+	+		+				
Mark					X				action plan; King 11 unnecessary; equation used; as a video solution related to video;

Name: Jeff Arnold

Section: 1 PM

Date: 9/21/06

Rec # 11

** Forgot to hand in on first day*

- Content
1. Audience Appropriateness
 2. Technical Details
 3. Visual Aids
 4. Creative

- Delivery
1. Structure
 2. Verbal Communication
 3. Non-Verbal Communication
 4. Impact

X = Weak

+ = Strong

Speaker	Content				Delivery				Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Jacob Stultz	X	+	+			+	+		A bit too much tech detail <i>low-level</i> good graphics
Robby Bryant		+				+			
Nichole D.			X			+			A bit too much text on slides
Yaa-Ling Tu	X	+				+	+		Material could have been ^{more} audience targeted
Dany Dunsire...			+				+		Good use of visuals; good eye contact
Anelone Marshal-C.		+							Starting with a shocking defining relog was a bit awkward
Laglie A.		X	+			+			Technical content was a bit light
Mark Burroughs	+	+	+			X			liked "for a EE..."; sounded nervous

Name: Jacob Stultz

Section: 11

Date: 9/21/06

- Content
1. Audience Appropriateness
 2. Technical Details
 3. Visual Aids
 4. Creative

- Delivery
1. Structure
 2. Verbal Communication
 3. Non-Verbal Communication
 4. Impact

X = Weak

+ = Strong

Speaker	Content				Delivery				Comments	
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4		
Robert Bryant						+				
Mike Dougherty	+		+			X	+			Seemed uncomfortable at start
Jeff Arnold		X	X			+	+			opening slide jargon heavy
Ling	X		+							timing, slide colors
Dany			+		+	X	X	+		power points
Antoine	+	+	X		+	X				transition of verbal slide where
Laplie	X			+		X	X			
Mark	X					X				? what's action potential

Name: Dany Bumsnych

Section: 11

Date: 9/21/06

- Content**
1. Audience Appropriateness
 2. Technical Details
 3. Visual Aids
 4. Creative

- Delivery**
1. Structure
 2. Verbal Communication
 3. Non-Verbal Communication
 4. Impact

X = Weak

+ = Strong

Speaker	Content				Delivery				Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Jacob	+							X	
Robert		+	X				+		Very clear, but could use more confidence
Mike					+				
Jeff			+			+		+	
Yan-Hing	X				+				more high-level explanations would help
Ashwini		X				+			very clear and precise, could use more detail of what you did
Luqman			+						
Mark		X							equations dense

Name: Artairne Madal-Cajigas

Section: 11

Date: 9/21/26

- Content
1. Audience Appropriateness
 2. Technical Details
 3. Visual Aids
 4. Creative

- Delivery
1. Structure
 2. Verbal Communication
 3. Non-Verbal Communication
 4. Impact

X = Weak

+ = Strong

Speaker	Content				Delivery				Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Jacob Stoltz			+				X		a little technical, but background explained well
Robbie Bryant						+			hard really good flow + diction
Michael Daugherty			-						simple + to the point; good.
JEFF Arnold									talk more in-depth
Ling						+			good flow despite non EES topic
Dany a.							X		part holding was distracting
Laplie			+			-			distracting hand movement, interesting project.
Mark B.						-			confused about what type of project this is.

Name: Mike Dougherty

Section: 11

Date: 9/21/06

- Content**
1. Audience Appropriateness
 2. Technical Details
 3. Visual Aids
 4. Creative

- Delivery**
1. Structure
 2. Verbal Communication
 3. Non-Verbal Communication
 4. Impact

X = Weak

+ = Strong

Speaker	Content				Delivery				Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Deek Stultz			+						Lets of time on Background
Robby Bryant		+							Many Acronyms but good
Mike Jeff			+			-			A little fast, talked to wall
Ling Tu		+	+						lots of writing on slides too much jargon
Danny Runnige			+			-			started soft a little unsure goal was explained well -> how to do it just ok
Antoine Machal-Lajigas			+			+			Antoinism's good took a while to introduce specific subject
Emilie Anderson			+						Visual Aids were important + used well
Mark Burroughs		-							Too many details, not much overview

Name: Laplie Anderson

Section: 11

Date: 9/22/06

- Content
1. Audience Appropriateness
 2. Technical Details
 3. Visual Aids
 4. Creative

- Delivery
1. Structure
 2. Verbal Communication
 3. Non-Verbal Communication
 4. Impact

X = Weak

+ = Strong

Speaker	Content				Delivery				Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Jacob	+				+	+	X		Hands was were distracting
Robert			-					+	Rushed ending, could use more detail
Michael					+		+		good structure/content, poor ending
Jeffrey	-								talked quickly, good beginning end
Ling		-	+						too many technical terms
Dany		+	+			+			good conclusion
Anfoinre							+		problem not outlined clearly
Mark		-							

Name:

Yaa-Ling Tu

Section:

11

Date:

9/21/06

Content

- 1. Audience Appropriateness
- 2. Technical Details
- 3. Visual Aids
- 4. Creative

Delivery

- 1. Structure
- 2. Verbal Communication
- 3. Non-Verbal Communication
- 4. Impact

X = Weak

+ = Strong

Speaker	Content				Delivery				Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Jacob Stultz	(X)	(+)	+			(+)	(X)		would be better to emphasize important points, crossed arms
Robert Bryant	+	X	(X)		(+)	+	(X)	+	read just shy; good example (amazon) for understandability
Mike Daugherty	+	(+)	(+)		+	(+)	(+)		good explanation/picture & relevance
Jeffrey Arnold	(+)		(+)	(+)		(+)	(-)	(+)	speaking quite fast
Danny Guinness	+		+			(-)	(-)		not present, and great visual
Anthony Machel-Ogboas	+	(+)			+	+		(+)	the picture really helped and appropriate good emphasis of importance
Lopik Anderson		(X)	(+)	+		(-)	(-)		I liked the story telling for most could have reached them & said what good to be seen various hard to follow (def seen him give paper talk)
Mark	(X)	(X)			X			(X)	

Name: ROBERT BRYANT

Section: Meyer, II²

Date: 9/21/06

Content

1. Audience Appropriateness
2. Technical Details
3. Visual Aids
4. Creative

Delivery

1. Structure
2. Verbal Communication
3. Non-Verbal Communication
4. Impact

X = Weak

+ = Strong

Speaker	Content				Delivery				Comments
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
SABR STULTZ		(-)			+				uses a lot of polishes. a little too much with anything. slightly unexclusive ending
Michael Daugherty	+	+				(-)			gets caught every once and a while, and has to pause to piece things back together, ending trailed off, at the beginning is inconclusive
Jeffrey Arnold			+			-			slow down!! makes a lot of statements that he doesn't backup
Ling									I really liked it! Kudos!
Dany Q.		+	+			+			How are reports actually used? Give me specific examples of your contributions. Very smooth & unexclusive ending. Good content, good explanation. Good transitions. A little quiet. Not passionate.
Anoine		-			+				
Laplie			+		+		(-)		
Mark		-	-			-			Too much technical details most people don't know about. No ending. Why is the dumping a what happens?