

## **PRESENTATION RUBRIC GRADING**

### **Motivation & Research Aim**

- (4)** The Background and Motivation is engaging and demonstrates the importance of the topic. Research Aim is clearly stated including the contributions of the overall project.
- (3)** The Background and Motivation is a straight forward explanation of the topic. Research Aim and workflow figure is provided as well. But either part could use a bit more detail with respect to details regarding the topic itself or the overall project application.
- (2)** The Background and the Research Aim are present, but both are a little general (i.e., sparse in details) and lacking in depth.
- (1)** Lacking any meaningful explanation of the importance of report topic. Research Aim provides very little detail the regarding the contributions of the project.
- (0)** Missing Background and Motivation, and Research Aim.

### **Data & Features**

- (4)** The dataset was explained in detail demonstrating an understanding of the problem space (i.e., source of the data) and the nature of the data (i.e., features and preprocessing). Clear examples of the data were also provided that aided the understanding of the data.
- (3)** Some minor details regarding the dataset, e.g., features and/or preprocessing, were missing, but the overall section was still understandable. Examples of the data were provided but could have been organized clearer.
- (2)** Aspects of the dataset were not explained with sufficient detail. Examples of the dataset were missing or examples were poor.
- (1)** Significant gaps with respect to the explanation of the dataset demonstrates a lack of understanding of the project. Examples of the dataset were missing or examples were poor
- (0)** Very little detail regarding the dataset is present or is missing. Examples of the dataset were missing or examples were poor

### **Method & Experiments**

- (4)** The methods were explained in detail, demonstrating an understanding of the tools and problem space. The experiment details were also presented clearly including the evaluations methods.
- (3)** Some minor details regarding the methods or experiments were missing, but the overall section was still understandable and demonstrates understanding of the project.
- (2)** The methods or experiments were not explained with sufficient detail, but the overall project implementation is reasonable.
- (1)** Significant gaps of with respect to the methodology demonstrates a lack of understanding of the project.
- (0)** Very little detail is present or missing.

### **Slide Quality**

- (4)** Slides are easy to follow and template is used properly.
- (3)** There are a few minor problems in the text (such as typos and grammar) and template format (such as text captions, references, or wasn't used properly).
- (2)** Some problems are present with the language of the text (language is unclear and/or shallow) which effects the technical aspects and analysis of the slides. There are some problems with the template as well.
- (1)** Significant problems are present with the language of the text (language is murky, confused and difficult to follow) which effect the understanding of the technical aspects of the poster. Slide template is not used properly.
- (0)** The slides does not follow a scholarly format in either technicality or format.

### **Presentation Quality**

- (4)** On-time and presented with great clarity. All relevant components of the project were presented.
- (3)** Slightly over or under time. Some components of the project were glossed over.
- (2)** Greatly over or under time. Major components of the project were not explained properly.
- (1)** Time constraints were not followed. Presentation did not provide any relevant information.
- (0)** Very poor presentation.

### **Q&A**

- (4)** Questions were answered demonstrating an understanding of the topic, data and methods used.
- (3)** Some questions could not be answered with confidence.
- (2)** Had difficulty answering questions.
- (1)** Could not answer critical questions.
- (0)** Questions were not answered at all.

### **References**

- (4)** Excellent, many relevant citations were used.
- (3)** Minimum number of citations were provided.
- (2)** Minimum number of citations were provided but some were questionable.
- (1)** Some citations were missing or were not of good quality.
- (0)** Relevant citations were not used.