

Cal Poly MSc Aerospace Engineering – Seminar Feedback Form

The following criteria should be used by all graduate students to evaluate the seminar of Masters Candidates in the Aerospace Engineering department at Cal Poly. Please return this form directly to the student.

Seminar Content						
Introduction and Background (literature review): Is it clear where this work lies in the context of the field both internal and external?	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Project Definition: Why is this work important? Is it clear what the scope and motivation are?	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Methodology: Are the methods employed fully described, relevant and correctly implemented? Are there any technical errors or problems?	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Validation: How were results validated? Is the validation relevant and provides confidence?	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Results: Are results presented and discussed in a clear and logical manner? Does the analysis of results relate to the project scope?	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Conclusions and Future Work: The summary clearly addresses motivation, scope and project statement and work still to be completed.	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Seminar Professionalism						
Appearance: Did the presenter appear professional. Were slides easy to read?	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Preparation: Was it clear the student had thought through the presentation in advance	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Responding: Did the student respond well to comments and questions from the audience.	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Not included	Needs significant improvement	Needs improvement	Good or developing	Very good	Excellent
Comments (2 positive and 2 areas for improvement)						