



**ROYAL
AERONAUTICAL
SOCIETY**

APPENDIX 1

**Submission for N E Rowe Medal Award
Branch Judging Proforma**

Branch:			
DoB & Award Group:	DoB:	< 22 years old	= 22 < 30 years old
Presentation Date & Age:	Pres'n Date: 20 June 18	Age: 22 June 1992	
Title of Paper:	SITUATION AWARENESS ASSESSMENT OF AOA DISPLAYS		
Entrant Names: 2nd in CAPS	SAM EVERETT.		
Judge's Names: 2nd in CAPS	DR RASHID ALI.		
Duration of Lecture	Allocated: 15 mins	Taken: 14-50 mins	

ASSESSMENT	SCORE
Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.	
Timing – Keeping the allotted time Comments: Good overall Timekeeping	4 / 5
Presentation of Case – Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion Comments: Relevant & To the point	7 / 10
Standard of Oral Presentation – Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow Comments: Very Good	8 / 10
Engagement with audience – Eye contact, interaction, kept attention/interest Comments:	3 / 5
Standard of Visual Presentation – Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation Comments: Excellent	4 / 5
Discussion – Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over Comments:	7 / 10
General – Originality, choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject Comments: potential to develop it into a very usefull tool in Ergonomic Design of Displays	13 / 15
TOTAL SCORE	46 / 60
Additional Comments:	
Judge's Name & Signature: DR RASHID ALI	




**ROYAL
AERONAUTICAL
SOCIETY**

APPENDIX 1

**Submission for N E Rowe Medal Award
Branch Judging Proforma**

Branch:	COVENTRY		
DoB & Award Group:	DoB: 22-6-92	< 22 years old	= 22 & 30 years old
Presentation Date & Age:	Pres'n Date: 20-6-18	Age: 26	
Title of Paper:	SITUATION AWARENESS ASSESSMENT OF A-0-A DISPLAYS		
Entrant Names: 2nd in CAPS	SAM EVERETT.		
Judge's Names: 2nd in CAPS	RON CARR AMRAs (CHAIRMAN)		
Duration of Lecture	Allocated: 15	mins	Taken: 14:50 mins

ASSESSMENT		SCORE
Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.		
Timing – Keeping the allotted time Comments:	Used time well	4 / 15
Presentation of Case – Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion Comments:	Flowed in easy manner, – well explained	8 / 10
Standard of Oral Presentation – Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow Comments:	All relevant areas were good	7 / 10
Engagement with audience – Eye contact, interaction, kept attention/interest Comments:	Good at all times	4 / 15
Standard of Visual Presentation – Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation Comments:	Impressive	5 / 15
Discussion – Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over Comments:	Made discussion interesting. answered questions, clearly	8 / 10
General – Originality, choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject Comments:	As flight deck requirements increase - this project could be developed for the future	14 / 15
TOTAL SCORE		50 / 60
Additional Comments:		
Judge's Name & Signature: RONALD CARR 		



**ROYAL
AERONAUTICAL
SOCIETY**

APPENDIX 1

**Submission for N E Rowe Medal Award
Branch Judging Proforma**

Branch:			
DoB & Award Group:	DoB: 22.6.92	< 22 years old	= 22 < 30 years old
Presentation Date & Age:	Pres'n Date: 20.6.18	Age: 25	
Title of Paper:	Situational Awareness Assessment of Augmented Reality		
Entrant Names: 2nd in CAPS	SAMUEL EVERETT. Displays.		
Judge's Names: 2nd in CAPS	D ^r BARRY MORSON.		
Duration of Lecture	Allocated: 15 mins	Taken: 15 mins	

ASSESSMENT		SCORE
Each section is to be scored following the criteria suggested below.		
Timing – Keeping the allotted time Comments: Good		4/5
Presentation of Case – Adequacy of introduction, development of theme or topic, relevancy of conclusion Comments: Wide ranging presentation within his topic		7/10
Standard of Oral Presentation – Spoken delivery, audibility, speed, flow Comments: Some gaps in spoken delivery.		5/10
Engagement with audience – Eye contact, interaction, kept attention/interest Comments: average eye contact but kept audience attention and interest.		4/5
Standard of Visual Presentation – Relevance, ease of reading and assimilation Comments: some "slides" difficult to see detail		3/5
Discussion – Ability to answer questions, ability to clarify and elaborate to get the message over Comments: Thought carefully about his answers to questions		7/10
General – Originality, choice of subject, relevance, technical content, grasp of subject Comments: could be useful if taken further.		9/15
TOTAL SCORE		39/60
Additional Comments: Generally difficult for entrant to cover all related topics within this project in investigation		
Judge's Name & Signature: D ^r B.D. MORSON <i>B.D. MORSON</i>		