|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presenter:** Nikitta | | **Topic:** Mitre Attack Framework | | |
| **Component** | **Exemplary 100%** | **Accomplished 90%** | **Developing 80%** | **Beginning 60%** |
| **Overview**  **10%** | Clear topic, question, & agenda. Relevant & clear background. | Clear topic, question, agenda and background, but could be more complete or polished. | Awkward or unclear topic, question, agenda and/or background | No topic, question, background, and/or agenda. |
| **\_\_\_\_/10** | The overall topic is well defined, | | | |
| **Verbal Style**  **15%** | Confident. Matching verbal and non-verbal style, good projection and inflection, spontaneous speaking. | Confident, generally fluid delivery and spontaneity but could improve. | Either fluent delivery but reading, or awkward delivery but spontaneous. | Poor style: long pauses, reading speech, "ummm"s, and other mannerisms, poor eye contact, monotone, and/or similar lack of confident and fluent delivery. |
| **\_\_\_\_/15** | Verbal cadence is kind of monotone, A little stumbly on words, likes to use the phrase “stuff like that”, | | | |
| **Coverage**  **15%** | Thorough coverage of topic and research with balanced treatment of findings. | Generally thorough and balanced, but awkward, needs more evidence, or better sequencing. | Either thorough but biased, or incomplete and balanced. | Very incomplete, significant gaps, or biased treatment of topic. |
| **\_\_\_\_/15** | The data thoroughly covered the topic, | | | |
| **Rationale**  **15%** | Logical reasoning integrated with authoritative references on key points. | Good logical reasoning and evidence, but not integrated. | Reasoning and evidence presented but not well organized or poor sources/sources not mentioned. | Little or no reasoning, explanation, or evidence provided. |
| **\_\_\_\_/15** | The presentation was well ordered, | | | |
| **Discussion**  **15%** | Prepared questions on key areas, elicit and responsive to participant reaction and questions. | Prepared discussion questions. | Discussion but without clear organization and purpose. | Little or no discussion. |
| **\_\_\_\_/15** | Did not really invite that much discussion during the presentation. | | | |
| **Reflection**  **15%** | Request feedback, clarify responses and link to further study, positive & curious. | Ask for feedback and clarify responses, generally non-defensive. | Ask for feedback; some defensiveness. | Little or no reflection. |
| **\_\_\_\_/15** |  | | | |
| **Graphics (Visuals/Slides)**  **15%** | Well-designed and attractive graphics that simplify or summary key ideas; original images or sources noted. Balanced layout, legible font. | Well done graphics but too much or too little, and/or not on key points; image sources generally noted. Layout generally balanced and legible font. | Graphics present but generally poor quality (illegible, inconsistent, etc.), and/or image sources not noted. Layout usually legible font. | No visuals, or slides, or layout/font generally not legible. |
| **\_\_\_\_/15** | Graphics and visuals are of a good professional quality | | | |
| **\_\_\_\_/100** | 🡨TOTAL (sum the scores above) | | | |

Additional Comments:

Note: you can award any # of points up to the max for the category, including fractional points. So, for example, if you think the work was half-way between accomplished and exemplary, you would award 95% of the points in that category. Always explain why you provided the points you provided, even if you award 100% of the points. What made the work exemplary in that category? Reflect on your peer’s work and give the justification you’d like to see if it was your work.

Note: you are grading their presentation, not just their slides. If you missed the actual presentation, or want to review it, it is available in the Panopto Recordings.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Point/Percentage Key | | | | |
| Points | 100% | 90% | 80% | 60% |
| 10 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 6 |
| 15 | 15 | 13.5 | 12 | 9 |