CS 5970: Empirical Methods

Project Status Grading Criteria (Checkpoint 3)

October 28, 2008

The oral proposal's grade will be split with 50% going to presentation and 50% to content.

Presentation: 50 points

Slides or Notes (slides highly encouraged): 20 points

(20) Slides/notes are uncluttered and useful in guiding the presentation. They do not need to be highly graphical but they should not be ugly.

(15) Slides/notes have one minor problem. For example, the slides have too much text or the coloring is difficult to read.

(10) Slides/notes have one major problem. For example, the slides do not track the presentation, they are not used in any way, they are all math (and no text), or illegible (difficult to achieve with powerpoint but possible!).

(5) Slides/notes have several major problems or are non-exist ant.

Oral delivery: 20 points

(20) The presentation was clear and audible to the entire room. Presentation was understandable and the presenter had no distracting nervous habits (such as pacing).

(15) Presentation had one minor delivery issue. For example, the presenter spent the entire time talking to the floor or the wall (and never facing the class) or nervously twiddling with the marker.

(10) Presentation had one major delivery issue. For example, the presenter talked so fast that hardly anyone could understand the talk or used inappropriate words.

(5) Presentation had several major delivery issues or was completely unintelligible.

Timing: 10 points

(10) The presentation was appropriately timed to fit in the assigned slot (10 minutes). The presenter answered questions but also knew how to not be distracted and was able to push the distractions to later.

(8) Timing had one minor issue. For example, the presentation went over by < 1 minute (I will cut you off anyway as we have tight timing).

(5) Timing had one major issue. For example, when I cut you off at your time limit, you are still on the introduction and have not presented your experiment.

(2) Timing had several major issues. For example, a question completely distracts you and you are unable to get back on track or to skip the right material to get back on track.

Content: 50 points

Organization: 25 points

(25) Organization of the talk was clear. Each slide followed logically from the previous slide and a summary ended the talk.

(20) There was one minor organizational issue. For example, the order of some slides was a bit jarring or the overall picture was not clear from the beginning.

(15) There was one major organizational issue. For example, the order of the talk did not make a lot of sense or a clear roadmap and summary was not given.

(10) The presentation had several major organizational issues.

(5) The organization was unacceptable. For example, the order of the slides was completely random or there was no discernible organization.

Required components: 25 points

Describe the Experiments: 7 points

(7) The specific set of exploratory experiments and the expected outcomes are described clearly.

(4) The experiment design is missing one of these components.

Describe and Interpret the Results: 6 points

(6) The description of the results is clear. The metrics of performance make sense and are appropriate for the problem. The interpretation of the results is clear.

(3) One of the above items is missing or is very unclear.

Specific Hypotheses: 6 points

(6) The (potentially updated) hypothesis (or hypotheses) is consistent with the experimental results. The hypothesis is testable in future experiments.

(3) The hypothesis does not follow from the previous work or it is unclear how to test the hypothesis.

Experimental Plan: 6 points

(6) The planned experiments are clearly designed to challenge the hypothesis. The experiments are feasible.

(3) The planned experiments do not provide support for the hypothesis, or the plans are not detailed enough to show that they are feasible.