

Research & Effort (50)	Exceeding Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Approaching Expectations
Contribution (20)	<p>All requirements and objectives are identified, evaluated, and completed with a high-level of quality and professionalism.</p> <p>The deliverable(s) offered a substantive amount of new information and interesting insights.</p>	<p>All requirements and objectives are identified, evaluated, and completed.</p> <p>The deliverable(s) offered some new information or interesting insights.</p>	<p>Many requirements and objectives are not identified, evaluated, and/or completed.</p> <p>The deliverable(s) offered no new information or insights.</p>
Subject Knowledge (10)	<p>The deliverable(s) demonstrated knowledge of the course content by integrating major and minor concepts into the work. The deliverable(s) also demonstrated evidence of extensive research effort and a depth of thinking about the topic.</p>	<p>The deliverable(s) demonstrated knowledge of the course content by integrating major and minor concepts into the work. The deliverable(s) also demonstrated evidence of limited research effort and/or depth of thinking about the topic.</p>	<p>The deliverable(s) did not demonstrate knowledge of the course content, evidence of research or depth of thinking about the topic.</p>
Supporting Material (10)	<p>All relevant information was obtained, and information sources were valid. Analysis and design considerations were well supported by the information.</p>	<p>Sufficient information was obtained, and most information sources were valid. Analysis and design considerations were mostly supported by the information.</p>	<p>Insufficient information is obtained and/or sources lack validity. Analysis and design considerations were not supported by the information collected.</p>
Conclusions & Future Work (10)	<p>Recommended solution is based on stated criteria, analysis and constraints.</p> <p>Alternative solutions and future work are considered, and each is appropriately and correctly analyzed for technical feasibility.</p>	<p>Solution/decision is reasonable; further analysis of some of the alternatives or constraints may have led to different recommendation.</p> <p>Alternative solutions and future work are considered, but analyses include some minor technical and/or procedural errors.</p>	<p>Only one solution is considered, or other solutions were ignored or incompletely analyzed. Many constraints and criteria were ignored.</p> <p>Little (or no) alternatives or future work are considered. Analyses are not substantive and/or include some major technical, procedural, and/or conceptual errors.</p>
Demo (10/25)	Exceeding Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Approaching Expectations
Contribution - TR = 5 points - PoC = 15 points	<p>The demonstration offered new information or approach about the chosen topic.</p> <p>The demonstration also showed strong effort was made in breaking new ground and building excitement about the project.</p>	<p>The demonstration offered some new information or approach about the chosen topic.</p> <p>The demonstration also showed some initial effort was made in building excitement about the project.</p>	<p>The demonstration was not complete and offered no new information or approach about the application.</p> <p>The demonstration also showed that little effort was made in building excitement about the project.</p>
Content & Creativity - TR = 5 points - PoC = 10 points	<p>The demonstration was imaginative and effective in conveying ideas to the audience.</p>	<p>The demonstration techniques used were effective in conveying main ideas, but a bit unimaginative.</p>	<p>The demonstration failed to capture the interest of the audience and/or is confusing in what was communicated.</p>
Technical Writing (25/10)	Exceeding Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Approaching Expectations
Composition - TR = 25 points - PoC = 10 points <div>nice work using LaTeX to write the paper! :)</div>	<p>The deliverable was well organized and clearly written. The underlying logic was clearly articulated and easy to follow. Words were chosen that precisely express the intended meaning and support reader comprehension.</p> <p>Diagrams or analyses enhance and clarify presentation of ideas.</p> <p>Sentences are grammatically correct and free from spelling errors.</p>	<p>The deliverable was organized and clearly written for the most part. In some areas the logic/flow of ideas were difficult to follow. Words were well chosen with some minor exceptions.</p> <p>Diagrams were consistent with the text.</p> <p>Sentences were mostly grammatically correct and only a few spelling errors were present, but they do not hinder the reader.</p>	<p>The deliverable lacked an overall organization. The reader had to make considerable effort to understand the underlying logic and flow of ideas.</p> <p>Diagrams were absent or inconsistent with the text.</p> <p>Grammatical and spelling errors made it difficult for the reader to interpret the text in places.</p>
Final Presentation (15)	Exceeding Expectations	Meeting Expectations	Approaching Expectations
Content & Creativity (5)	<p>The presentation contained an abundance of material which clearly related to the main arguments.</p> <p>Substantial external research was used to justify arguments or solutions.</p> <p>The presentation of the material was original and interesting, and presented in a creative way that held audience attention.</p>	<p>The presentation contained an appropriate amount of material to support the main arguments. The material clearly related to the main arguments.</p> <p>External research was used to justify arguments or solutions.</p> <p>The presentation of the material was interesting and creative, and held audience attention.</p>	<p>The audience had to make considerable effort to understand the underlying logic and flow of ideas.</p> <p>Very little (or no) external research was used to justify arguments or solutions.</p> <p>The presentation lacked creativity and did not hold audience attention.</p>
Coherence & Organization (5)	<p>The thesis, argument, solution, and conclusion were clearly stated, and examples were appropriate.</p> <p>The transitions and flow were easy to follow.</p> <p>The presentation and any slides were error-free and logically presented.</p>	<p>The thesis, argument and solution were clearly stated. Most (but not all) examples were supportive illustrations.</p> <p>The transitions and/or flow were somewhat difficult to follow</p> <p>The presentation and any slides were error-free and logically presented.</p>	<p>The thesis, argument, solution and/or conclusion were unclear.</p> <p>The transitions and flow were not easy to follow.</p> <p>Slides contained errors and a lack of logical progression.</p>
Speaking Skills & Style (5)	<p>The audio and any visuals are clear (i.e., easy to hear and see).</p> <p>Presenter(s) were poised and had clear articulation.</p> <p>Presenter(s) spoke and participated at a very high and balanced level.</p> <p>Enthusiasm and confidence were exuded.</p> <p>The presentation fit into the time allotment of 10 minutes.</p>	<p>The audio and any visuals are clear (i.e., easy to hear and see).</p> <p>Presenter(s) were mostly poised and had clear articulation of their topic.</p> <p>Presenter(s) spoke and participated at a reasonable and balanced level.</p> <p>Enthusiasm, and perhaps light discomfort with (pre-recorded) public speaking, was exuded.</p> <p>The presentation fit into the time allotment of 10 minutes or were over/under only by a small amount.</p>	<p>The audio and any visuals were often inaudible and/or hard to see.</p> <p>Presenter(s) could not clearly articulate their topic.</p> <p>Presenter(s) made distracting on-screen gestures (e.g., moving the mouse around a lot unnecessarily).</p> <p>Presenter(s) displayed little or no enthusiasm or interest. A high level of discomfort with (pre-recorded) public speaking was exuded.</p> <p>The presentation did not make effective use of the allotted time (e.g., very short or very long video)</p>
Comments			

overall it was a nice project idea. The paper was pretty high-level though, and often repetitive. You nicely captured high-level differences between TypeI & TypeII hypervisors but didn't go deep into any topics! (memory management? file systems? I/O? etc.)