DESN2000 (Computer Engineering) 2026 T2
Design Presentation (20%)

Last updated: 12.06.2026

Task

As a team, develop a 9-minute presentation to convince the audience that your team has created the best solution to the problem. How you structure the available time is up to you. However, you need to:

1. Briefly motivate and define your design problem, including a consideration of your users.
2. Describe your proposed design solution and how it is exceptional.
3. Describe how you would validate your design, convincing the audience that it will work.

You may assume the audience has some basic understanding (not deep) of the project. The marking criteria provide further guidance.

Table 1: Summary of crucial assessment details

Type	**Group**
Submission	Live in-person presentation
Due date	Submit the slides to *Give* by week 4 Sunday 11.59 pm. Late submissions will attract a standard 5% flat penalty per day. Your live in-person presentations will be during the week 5 lecture time slots.
Weighting	20%
Length	No more than 9 minutes. A penalty of 5% applies for every 15 seconds over time. After the presentation, 2 minutes are allocated for questions
Marking	Marked by demonstrators & moderated by coordinators
Team evaluation	Yes. A survey is used to moderate individual marks.

Marking

The assessment will be marked by demonstrators and moderated by course coordinators. The submission is worth 20% of your final grade. Marks will be returned within two weeks of the presentation. The marking rubric below outlines how your presentation will be marked. Please read it and the rest of this guide carefully.

Table 2: Marking rubric – final mark is scaled to 20% of grade

Problem (assessed as a group and adjusted based on team evaluation) Motivate and define your problem, including a consideration of your users.					
Presentation missing, or little to no effort made to address the problem.	Explanation of the problem was missing; consideration of users and stakeholders was missing.	Explanation of the problem and its importance was confusing or incomplete: users and stakeholders were mentioned, but their needs were not described.	Explanation of the problem and its importance was clear: users/stakeholders were identified with their needs briefly described.	Explanation of the problem and its significance was clear and well-evidenced: users/stakeholders identified, with their needs described and linked to the problem definition. Some sources were cited to	Explanation of the problem and its significance was very compelling; consideration of users/stakeholders was thorough and well-evidenced, with their needs explicitly shaping the problem definition. Relevant

				substantiate the problem and stakeholder needs.	sources and research were cited to substantiate the problem and stakeholder needs.
0	4	8	12	16	20
Solution (assessed as a group and adjusted based on team evaluation) Describe your proposed design and how it excels at solving your problem.					
Little to no effort made to describe the design solution.	Explanation of the design was confusing or relied on undefined concepts; no design requirements or constraints identified.	Explanation of the design was mostly clear and describes how it addresses the problem, but key requirements/constraints were not stated.	Explanation of the design was clear, key design requirements/constraints were identified; but has not given much thought to balancing the security, practicality and user experience.	Explanation of the design was clear, key requirements/constraints identified; considers balancing the security, practicality and user experience, but the argument for why the team's approach is superior lacked supporting evidence.	Explanation of the design is clear, the team identifies key design requirements/constraints, well considers balancing the security, practicality and user experience, and argues with evidence why their approach is superior.
0	4	8	12	16	20
Validation and feasibility (assessed as a group and adjusted based on team evaluation) Describe the validation of your design, to convince the engineering audience it works and is feasible.					
Little to no effort made.	Design is technically unfeasible. Design has no validation with evidence. Most assumptions are unstated or unreasonable, and most decisions lack a justification.	Design is technically feasible. Design has minimal validation with evidence, such as a single calculation, model, datasheet comparison, standard or equivalent, presented without interpretation. Assumptions are stated but not ranked, and many decisions are not justified.	Design is technically feasible. Design is validated with adequate design-stage evidence, such as calculations, models, datasheet comparisons, standards or equivalent. Most assumptions are reasonable, and key decisions are justified against the requirements.	Design is technically feasible. Design is validated with adequate design-stage evidence, such as calculations, models, datasheet comparisons, standards or equivalent. Assumptions are reasonable and ranked with a well-known method, and decisions are justified. A validation plan states how the design will be tested, with at least one quantified acceptance criterion.	Design is technically feasible. Design is validated with ample design-stage evidence, such as calculations, models, datasheet comparisons, standards or equivalent, including analysis performed by the team itself. Assumptions are all reasonable, ranked with a well-known method, and decisions are all well-justified. A validation plan maps every key requirement to a planned test with quantified acceptance criteria.
0	4	8	12	16	20
Communication (marked individually) Visual and verbal presentation quality. Give the audience a clear and convincing delivery.					
Little to no effort made.	Presentation is not logically ordered and hard to understand.	Presentation is not logically ordered and hard to understand. It is easy to hear the spoken words and	Presentation is logically ordered and easy to understand. It is easy to hear the speech and writing is fluent.	Presentation is logically ordered and easy to understand. It is easy to hear the speech and writing is fluent.	Presentation is logically ordered and easy to understand. It is easy to hear the speech and writing is fluent.

	It is hard to hear it and writing has mistakes. It does not use storytelling to make it interesting and engaging. It does not use figures to communicate ideas.	writing has no mistakes. It does not use storytelling to make it interesting and engaging. It uses figures effectively to communicate ideas. There was reliance on scripted reading.	It uses storytelling techniques to make it interesting and is somewhat engaging. It uses figures effectively to communicate ideas. There was no reliance on scripted reading.	Its explanation of technology is easy to understand. It uses storytelling techniques to make it interesting and is engaging. It uses figures effectively to communicate ideas. There was no reliance on scripted reading or a memorised script.	Its explanation of technology is easy to understand. It uses storytelling techniques to make it interesting and is very engaging. It uses figures effectively to communicate ideas, with minimum text. There was no reliance on scripted reading, palm cards, notes or a memorised script.
0	8	16	24	32	40

Tips and resources

- Keep text on your slides to a minimum. Aim for a few words only.
- All students in your team must speak to be eligible for marks, except for any special consideration.
- Do not read off the slides. Make sure the visual and verbal components balance each other. If slides have lots of information, then what you say should be simple, and vice versa.
- Carefully design slides, use templates from sites for help. We're engineers, not graphic designers after all.
- Include schematics/real photos/screenshots of your design where possible.
- Use large, high-resolution images, ideally your own.
- Make sure graphs are carefully constructed; the implications and impact should be straightforward to interpret.
- Make sure everything is clear and easy to read.
- Keep content focused and to the point, avoid unnecessary details.
- Don't use scripts or palm cards for the final version. Feel free to use them during practice.
- Make sure the presentation flows logically between sections.
- While this assessment values clear, engaging and convincing presentations, and good visual communication is part of that, it is not a contest for the production quality.

Team evaluation

The Communication component is marked individually. The other components are assessed as a group and adjusted based on team evaluation, which is described below.

A team evaluation survey will open around the submission deadline to gauge individual contributions towards completing this task. The results will inform whether marks for individual team members will be adjusted from the received team grade. All students are expected to fill in this survey with fair and honest evaluations of the job done by their teammates. Deadline for

completing the contribution form will be 11:59 PM, Friday (Week 5). Each of you must fill out indicating the contribution made by each member of the group towards the presentation.

*individual mark = contribution_factor * (presentation_mark),* where,

*contribution_factor = (average percentage assigned to the individual) * (no. of group members in the group)/ 100*

Please note that the contribution factor is capped at 1.05. Coordinators may adjust the contribution factor in cases of significant inconsistencies or partially completed forms.

Submission

Please upload your presentation slides (in PPT/PPTX or PDF format) to *Give* by the deadline (week 4 Sunday 11.59 pm). These slides will be downloaded by the demonstrators and made available on the computer connected to the projector. For a group, only one member of the group should submit the presentation slides.