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| **TO:** *Ms. Hunter*  **FROM:** *Emily Lane*  **DATE:** *2/28/13*  **SUBJECT:** *Progress Report #4: Presentation*  **PREVIOUS BACKGROUND:** *Paper defense presentation occurred this week*  **TIME FRAME:** *2/22/13 – 2/28/13*  **HOURS SPENT:** *4 Hours*  **WORK COMPLETED**   * *Paper defense presented* * *Location brainstorming*   **WORK SCHEDULED**   * *Consultation with Ms. Shoemake* * *Secure location* * *Secure interviews*   **PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED**   * *TIME MANAGEMENT* * *Motivation* * *Cruddy paper defense*   **REFLECTIVE JOURNAL**  The paper defenses upset me. I am not placing blame anywhere, but generally, I found the whole process unfair and wasteful. The first issue I had was that the guidelines for what should be included in the presentation were never really clear. Up until about last week, I was under the impression that the presentation was solely about the paper, not the process, and not the project. However, this was an easily fixable situation. The biggest problem I had with the paper defenses was the inconsistency. Presenting in front of this class is a lot simpler than presenting in front of a random sophomore class, Mrs. Phillips, and Mr. Sutton. I felt that the presentations done on this last day were graded harsher because I got the same grade as a certain someone (not going to name drop) who did much worse on the second day of presentations. I don’t care that much, it just seems like an inconsistent system of grading which is kind of unfair. Either way, the feedback I got upset me a bit. It was mentioned that my slides were, “organizationally a mess,” and I am not really sure what about them was unorganized. One graph was blurry, understood. But organizationally I thought my slides were decent. Basically, I felt like I expected to be presenting just to our class and instead it was to a firing squad.  All of this discouraged me for a bit but I have gotten over it. This year’s kind of a mess and I really just want to be done. |
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