

Parallel Computing AMS530 by Y. Deng

Project 5 the Final Project Grading Sheet for '25

Order	Name	Problem	Grades					
			Opening	Org	Content	Delivery style	Ending	Total
Day 1 (12/02/2025) 5:00-7:00pm in AMS Seminar Room								
1	Zheng, Alan	5.1						
2	Lukacsy, Bence	5.1						
3	Nijjar, Inderpreet	5.1						
4	Iskhakov, Samuel	5.1						
5	Wang, Xiaoli	5.1						
6	Wei, Zijun	5.1						
7	Park, Brian	5.2						
8	Hamilton, Darren	5.2						
9	Martin, Joshua	5.2						
10	Shapourmiandouab, Samin	5.2						
11	Chu, Yunpeng	5.2						
12	Rutherford, Ashlynn	5.2						
Day 2 (12/04/2025) 5:00-7:00pm in AMS Seminar Room								
13	Uwechue, Demi	5.3						
14	Kennedy, Christopher	5.3						
15	Chan, Lik Chun	5.3						
16	Yilmaz, Faruk	5.3						
17	Li, Zhenglou	5.3						
18	Bajaj, Avi	5.4						
19	Eng, Hansen	5.4						
20	Tang, Ran	5.4						
21	Xu, Saibo	5.4						
22	Maloy, Benjamin	5.5*						

Parallel Computing AMS530 by Y. Deng

Please review grading rubric carefully:

Grading Guide	Opening (MAX: 1.0 Point)	a. A clear introduction to the topic. b. An outline of the presentation.
	Organization (MAX: 1.0 Point)	a. Key ideas were clearly articulated. b. Main points were well organized and connected logically. c. Each section was introduced and concluded effectively.
	Contents (MAX: 10.0 Points)	a. The project's questions are fully and accurately answered. b. Accurate data and robust supporting materials are provided. c. Thorough analysis of key data and the main technical points is presented.
	Delivery style (MAX: 1.0 Point)	a. The PowerPoint presentation was well prepared. b. Content was presented with consistent emphasis. c. The presenter did not read from the materials.
	Closing (MAX: 1.0 Point)	a. Major results are clearly summarized. b. Suggestions for further work to improve the study are provided.

Additional Notes:

1. You may continue to incorporate results and discoveries into the PowerPoint presentation after submitting the report but before the presentation deadline.
2. Please review this grading rubric to understand how to evaluate your peers (and yourself).
3. Exercise your grading authority responsibly; assigning identical scores to all students or awarding minimal (approximately 0) or maximum (approximately 14) points is deemed unprofessional. Grading sheets will be scrutinized to identify outlier evaluators for each student prior to excluding the highest and lowest scores.
4. Attendance at both sessions is mandatory and in person. Absence will result in a grade penalty.
5. Each presentation lasts 10 minutes (including Q&A). Grading is conducted anonymously.