

EE 433 Final Exam/Project Presentations

The Final Project Presentations will be held during the Final Exam time, currently scheduled for **Monday, Dec. 21, 0755-1055** in TBD.

The following guidelines apply:

- Presentations should be 20-25 minutes in length, with up to 15 minutes for Q&A, for a nominal 25-30 minutes per group (maximum of 40 minutes/group). Presentations that go beyond 25 minutes will be abruptly cut off.
- Assuming 2 minutes per slide, your presentation should consist of no more than 10 slides in the body of the presentation, one title slide, one outline slide, and one conclusion slide (13 maximum).
- Your presentations should be geared toward an audience that is generally knowledgeable but does not know the specifics of wireless communications (i.e., you do need to explain how things like link budgets, models, etc. work).
- One presentation per project group. Understand that there is an interrelationship between the project groups, but that each groups part of the project should stand alone. The order of presentation is:
 - OpenBTS System Installation and Operation
 - Propagation Modeling and System Prediction
 - Measurement and Validation

Mechanics:

Final Written Reports Due:	Thursday, December 10, 1700
Reports Graded With Comments:	Within 48 Hours
Revised Reports Due:	Sunday, December 20, 0755
Oral Project Presentation:	Monday, December 21, 0755

Final written reports should be prepared using the format posted on the EE433 Website. The instructor will return graded reports with comments, which may be revised for a grade improvement. The instructor will then email to each group a list of items or questions that should be addressed during the oral presentation and/or incorporated into a revised version of the report. This format has worked well in the past, as it helps speed the question & answer time and expedite the presentation process.

Just like the project report, each presentation should address the following three topics:

Introduction & Problem Statement. Provide a brief overview/need/motivation of your project and address the need/motivation, goals, and objectives for the project.

Background. Provide a brief overview of any necessary background material. Use this section to educate your audience on any specifics they will need to know to understand the technical details of your project component (e.g., introduce propagation, channel models, link budgets, etc.). Limit to a maximum of 1/3 of your presentation, or 3 slides.

Methodology/Approach. Describe briefly how you went about addressing your problem. Analysis, simulation, design, and code examples should be presented in this section.

Results. 1-2 Slides that summarize the major findings and results of your work. Compare predicted vs. measured data, predicted vs. actual performance, and share any results that demonstrate whether your project was successful.

Discussion & Conclusion. Discuss what worked and what didn't work. If something was unsuccessful, explain why it was unsuccessful and what (if anything) needs to be addressed/improved/corrected to make it successful. If you had success, explain how your success fits into the broader context of the problem you are addressing.

Team Members: _____

Evaluator: _____

Item	0	3	5	Score (0-5)	Weight	Score
Introduction	Not given	Need, and objectives presented but incomplete	Clear & concise “forest view” of project		x 1 =	
Problem Overview	Missing	Present but not motivated or vague.	Mission and expected outcome clearly motivated and articulated		x 1 =	
Background	Insufficient level of detail for design	Incomplete description of important material, including channel models, link budgets, or system operations.	Wireless system operation and associated models clearly articulated and tied together.		x 2 =	
Engineering Requirements	Missing	Present but not justified, quantified, or too abstract	Present, fully justified, and appropriately formed		x 2 =	
Methodology	Insufficient level of detail for design	Some but not all of the approach is described; missing steps or incomplete information.	Clearly described approach to analyzing the problem space and associated engineering process.		x 2 =	
Design Architecture	Insufficient level of detail for design	Some but not all design decisions sufficiently described.	Block diagrams & functional descriptions clearly provided. Design decisions justified.		x 3 =	
Engineering Analysis	Barely substantiate data, simulation, or predicted results; no discussion performance differences between predicted and tested.	Some discussion of data, simulation, or predictions; delineated the origin of some performance differences between predicted and tested.	Clearly and concisely discussed data, simulation, and predicted results and tied all three together. Clearly delineated the origin of performance differences; identified contributors.		x 4 =	
Response to Questions	Team is completely thrown or defensive	Team struggled with some questions but maintained composure	Answered questions readily and professionally		x 1 =	
Slide Quality	Completely illegible	Some slides are difficult to read	Slides are legible, correct, and visually appealing		x 2 =	
Presence	Mumbling and/or no eye contact	Low energy but understandable and with eye contact	Dynamic and charismatic		x 1 =	
Professionalism	Late, not prepared, too long/short	Proper timing, but presentation contains typos, seems rough, inadequate figure/slide titles.	Presentation is polished, professional, and clearly delivered, clear & concise titles.		x 1 =	
Presentation Score:					Sum:	