|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation | Expert (10) | Competent (7) | Not yet competent (4) |
| Depth of content | Speaker provides accurate and complete explanations of key concepts and theories, drawing on outside sources if appropriate. Listeners gain insights. | Speaker provides explanations of concepts that are mostly accurate and complete. Some helpful insights are included. | Explanations of concepts and/or theories are inaccurate or incomplete. Little insights are provided. |
| Accuracy of content | Information (names, facts, etc.) included in the presentation is consistently accurate. | No significant errors are made. Listeners recognize any errors to be the result of nervousness or oversight. | Enough errors are made to distract a knowledgeable listener. Some information is accurate but the listener must determine what information is reliable. |
| Discussion of pro and cons | The quality of the work is discussed, including highlighting valuable ideas and problematic aspects of the work.  Consequences for future work in the area are discussed, beyond content provided in the paper . | Provides some insightful commentary, but not to the degree of “expert.” The criticisms may be largely found in the paper. | Criticism is shallow, trivial, invalid, and/or missing. |
| Discussion Lead | Has prepared deep questions to spark discussion or debate about the work. Leads and sustains a lively discussion. | Presenters clearly prepared with a mix of typical and insightful questions. Conversation may be lively or drag depending on the mood of the class. | Discussion reflects poor or shallow preparation; presenters are unable to respond to questions or comments thoughtfully. |

CIS700 (Security of Machine Learning) Rubric Grade: \_\_\_/15  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  
Paper(s):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation | Expert (5) | Competent (4) | Not yet competent (2) |
| Time Management | Completes presentation in time allotted, including the discussion. | Presentation is completed on time but may be slightly rushed at the end. | Presentation skips important topics due to time limit. |
| Responsiveness to the audience | Consistently clarifies, restates, and responds to questions. Summarizes when needed. | Generally responsive to audience questions and needs. Misses some opportunities for interaction. | Responds to questions inadequately. |
| Organization | Presentation is clear, logical, and organized. Listener can follow line of reasoning. | Presentation is generally clear and well organized. A few minor points may be confusing. | Organization is haphazard; listener can follow presentation only with effort. Arguments are not clear. |
| Presentation format | Communication aids enhance presentation. - The font on the visuals is readable. - Information is represented and organized to maximize audience comprehension.  - Details are minimized so that mainpoints stand out. | Communication aids contribute to the quality of the presentation.  - Font size is mostly readable.  - Appropriate information is included.  - Some material is not supported by visual aids. | Communication aids are poorly prepared or used inappropriately.  - Font size is too small to read.  - Too much information is included. - Details or some unimportant information is highlighted, and may confuse the audience. |

**Technical**

**Non-Technical**

Adapted from <https://www.papernot.fr/teaching/rubric.pdf> who adapted it from the Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence, Carnegie Mellon University.