

Low score-----High score

Structure	Some of the relevant information is presented without discernible flow/logic to the order of the presentation and/or the presentation does not adhere to the given time constraints.	Most of the information presented is relevant, but some important information is missing and/or the order in which information is presented is not suitable for an audience which was not involved in the project. Presentation is significantly too long or too short.	All relevant information (intro, background, solutions to problems with algorithms, demo of code) is presented and information mostly builds on prior information in a logical manner. Presentation nearly fits given time constraints.	Presentation has a logical flow, with an introduction, necessary background information, appropriate information (including algorithms) about how (some) encountered problems were solved, and a live-demonstration of code. Presentation adheres to the given time constraints.
Engagement/Style	Presenters read manuscript/slides, are unaware of audience reaction, and/or engage in distracting activities, such as chewing gum, making unnecessary noise, or turning their back to the audience when explaining information on the screen; audience is neither involved by the presenters nor able to ask relevant questions. Hardly any relevant background information is provided. Time division is very unequal.	One or both presenters are often hard to understand due to lack in clarity or volume of speech and engage in ineffective activities, such as pointing to the computer screen with a finger (which cannot be seen by the audience), scrolling through code in search of a piece to explain; audience is not involved other than asking questions. Important background information is missing or hard to understand since not explained well enough. Presenters do not share time equally – but each covers at least $1/(n+1)$ of the presentation time (e.g. $1/3$ of there are 2)	One or both presenters create an active connection to the majority of the audience during the majority of the presentation; speak with appropriate clarity and/or volume. Most relevant background information is provided. Explanation lacks a bit but is supported by visual enhancements. Presenters might not share equally in time, but each presenter contributes significantly to the presentation.	Both presenters create active connection with the majority of the audience during the majority of the presentation, maintains eye contact and gives appropriate background information and explanations for the audience to follow. Speech is clear and loud enough and there is enough use of visual enhancement. Get audience involved through asking questions or other activities. All presenters take part equally in presenting and in answering questions.

Thoroughness of Explanations	Explanations of key concepts and programming parts are muddled and unclear;	The explanation of key concepts and programming parts include too many details or are too general;	Key concepts and the programming part are explained using examples and/or illustrations. Most explanations are at the appropriate level.	Important aspects of how the code implements the project are thoroughly explained. Presenter provides explanations of the key coding aspects (with code)
Breadth of Preparedness	<p>Presenters have little, badly prepared or no visual enhancements related to the presentation topic.</p> <p>Demonstration of code shows that there are significant and basic unresolved problems; presenters seem at times not aware of the problems.</p>	<p>Presenters have visual enhancements, but slides, demo steps, etc. are often not communicating the necessary information and/or presenters skip back-and-forth through slides or pages of code.</p> <p>Demonstration of code shows that there are problems which the presenters are not aware of and/or which impact the presented solution in major ways.</p>	<p>Presenters use visual enhancements (slides, code demo, etc.) throughout the presentation, but at times the information shown might be too cluttered, contain too much detail, or might be too vague.</p> <p>Demonstrations of code work nearly all the time and shows major parts of project work.</p> <p>All of the presented information is nearly correct.</p>	<p>Presenter is well prepared (slides) and demo shows breadth of project convincingly. S/he is capable of answering questions convincingly.</p> <p>The code demo is meaningful, highlighting major accomplishments, and works.</p> <p>Presenters use appropriate visual enhancements (slides, code demo, etc.) throughout the presentation to effectively (the audience understands) and efficiently (in a short amount of time) communicate complex information.</p> <p>All information presented is correct.</p>
Level of Difficulty	The level of difficulty of the completed (part of the) project is low.	The level of difficulty of the completed (part of the) project is moderate.	The level of difficulty of the completed (part of the) project is within reach when stretching.	The level of difficulty of the completed (part of the) project is high and challenging.