|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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. |
| **10/10** | The topic was well defined, and it was very clear what he was presenting on | | | |
| **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. |
| **14/15** | Overall the delivery was pretty good but the verbal cadence is kind of monotone, A little stumbly on words, likes to use the phrase “stuff like that” when he is nervous or giving himself time to think. | | | |
| **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. |
| **14/15** | The data presented thoroughly covered the topic, though there was a such large amount of data that some things just got glossed over due to a perceived time constraint | | | |
| **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. |
| **15/15** | The presentation was well ordered, it followed a logical series of steps that led one from another. His references seemed to be from an authoritative place. | | | |
| **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. |
| **13.5/15** | There was very little discussion during the presentation. Most of the discussion took place after the presentation due to questions from the audience. There seemed to be no prepared discussion questions and the ones that seemed like they might have been there came about as mostly statements or generated little to no discussion. | | | |
| **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. |
| **15/15** | When the audience requested, he was responsive and seemed to be knowledgeable in the subject and generally sought to make sure that his answer satisfied the questioner’s requirements. His general outlook was positive and generally open to questions. | | | |
| **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. |
| **15/15** | Graphics and visuals are of a good professional quality. The font style and color paired with the background made the slides information easy to read. Sources noted at the end of the presentation. The only thing that I could find wrong with he visuals/slides is that there was at points too much information but I believe that is due to the subject more than to anything the presenter did or did not do so I am giving full marks in this category. | | | |
| **96.5/100** | 🡨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 |