

2023 Seismic Design Competition

Presentation Requirements:

Each team is required to give an oral presentation no longer than <u>ten minutes</u> to a panel of judges at the scheduled time for the team. Judges will have up to five minutes to ask questions following the presentation. The presentations will be open to the public.

Teams must follow the instructions and guidelines for the presentation below.

A projector and laptop, running Microsoft Windows 7 or newer, and PowerPoint (Office 2007 or newer) will be provided. The presentation files will be uploaded to the competition laptop by the SLC prior to the first presentation. Teams must submit their presentation files by email *before* the week of the competition (check the official website for exact deadline). Teams are responsible for software compatibility. Teams may check software compatibility during the scheduled time for Check-in and Registration. All presentations must be lined up and checked before the session begins to ensure a faster transition for the teams presenting.

Presentations shall include the following:

- Name of school on title slide
- Name of building on title slide
- Description of structural system
- Architectural concept
- Geotechnical considerations including seismic site class
- Analysis methods and results
- Performance predictions
- Damping devices (optional)
- Structural design innovation (optional)

For more information, please see the presentation judging rubric below. Any team that does not present at the scheduled time will have 100 added to *V* (Section 4.4).

Any team that does not email their final presentation by the deadline will have 10 added to V (Section 4.4).



2023 Seismic Design Competition

Score Sheet 1: Presentation

School:_____

Judge:_____

Note: Judges please check, circle, or highlight the scoring criteria for the most appropriate score in each category. Do not write in the score.

| Category | Score | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | <u>SLC use</u> <u>ONLY)</u> |
| Structural System Concept | Inappropriate system for seismic applications Structural system would not work with building concepts | May work as a system for seismic applications Structural system may work with other building concepts | Appropriate system for seismic applications Structural system would work with other building components | Ideal system for seismic resistance Structural system works very well with other building components | /4 |
| Geotechnical Considerations | Site class not stated or unreasonable wrong No/very little information about the geological conditions or history of the site | A reasonable site class is stated with little reasoning provided Minimal information about the geological conditions or history of the site | A reasonable site class is stated with reasoning Adequate information about the geological conditions or history of the site | A reasonable site class is stated with convincing reasoning Detailed information about the geological conditions or history of the site | /2 |
| Architectural Concept | Rendering incomplete or not aesthetically pleasing No environmental and ADA accessibility considerations mentioned No architectural considerations | Rendering looks somewhat aesthetically pleasing Minimal environmental and ADA accessibility considerations Some architectural considerations | Rendering is aesthetically pleasing and with a satisfactory level of details Some thoughtful environmental and ADA accessibility considerations Show initiative to innovate architecturally | Rendering is very aesthetically pleasing with a high level of details Many thoughtful environmental and ADA accessibility considerations Overall unique and memorable architecture | /2 |



2023 Seismic Design Competition

| Analysis Method | Poor/no explanation of analysis method Shows poor/no understanding of structural systems Unreasonable predictions | Good explanation of analysis method Shows some understanding of the structural system Unreasonable predictions | Very good explanation of analysis method Shows good understanding of the structural system Reasonable predictions | Excellent explanation of analysis method Shows excellent understanding of the structural system Exceptional predictions | /4 |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Clarity and Organization | No logical organization Poor use of slides Design concept not understood | Poor logical organization Good use of slides Design concept mostly understood | Good logical organization Very good use of slides Design concept understood | Excellent logical organization Excellent use of slides Design concept clearly understood | /4 |
| Communication Skills | No eye contact with audience, or reads entirely from slides Audience disengaged Unable to answer questions | Some eye contact, but mostly reads from slides Audience somewhat engaged Attempts to answer questions, but not accurately | Consistent eye contact with little reference to slides Audience is mostly engaged and interested Understands and answers questions | Maintains eye contact throughout presentations Audience is consistently engaged and interested Understands and answers questions thoroughly | /4 |
| | | | | Total: | /20 |

Additional Comments (will be anonymously provided to the team): ______