| Research & Effort (50) | Exceeding Expectations | Meeting Expectations | Approaching Expectations |
|---|--|---|--|
| Contribution (20) | All requirements and objectives are | All requirements and objectives are | Many requirements and objectives are not |
| | identified, evaluated, and completed with a high-level of quality and professionalism. | identified, evaluated, and completed. | identified, evaluated, and/or completed. |
| | The deliverable(s) offered a substantive amount of new information and interesting insights. | The deliverable(s) offered some new information or interesting insights. | The deliverable(s) offered no new information or insights. |
| Subject Knowledge (10) | The deliverable(s) demonstrated knowledge of the course content by integrating major and minor concepts into the work. The deliverable(s) also demonstrated evidence of extensive research effort and a depth of thinking about the topic. | The deliverable(s) demonstrated knowledge of the course content by integrating major and minor concepts into the work. The deliverable(s) also demonstrated evidence of limited research effort and/or depth of thinking about the topic. | The deliverable(s) did not demonstrate knowledge of the course content, evidence of research or depth of thinking about the topic. |
| Supporting Material (10) | All relevant information was obtained, and information sources were valid. Analysis and design considerations were well supported by the information. | Sufficient information was obtained, and most information sources were valid. Analysis and design considerations were mostly supported by the information. | Insufficient information is obtained and/or sources lack validity. Analysis and design considerations were not supported by the information collected. |
| Conclusions & Future Work (10) | Recommended solution is based on stated criteria, analysis and constraints. | Solution/decision is reasonable; further analysis of some of the alternatives or constraints may have led to different recommendation. | Only one solution is considered, or other solutions were ignored or incompletely analyzed. Many constraints and criteria were ignored. |
| | Alternative solutions and future work are considered, and each is appropriately and correctly analyzed for technical feasibility. | Alternative solutions and future work are considered, but analyses include some minor technical and/or procedural errors. | Little (or no) alternatives or future work are considered. Analyses are not substantive and/or include some major technical, procedural, and/or conceptual errors. |
| Demo (10/25) | Exceeding Expectations | Meeting Expectations | Approaching Expectations |
| Contribution - TR = 5 points - PoC = 15 points | The demonstration offered new information or approach about the chosen topic. | The demonstration offered some new information or approach about the chosen topic. | The demonstration was not complete and offered no new information or approach about the application. |
| | The demonstration also showed strong effort was made in breaking new ground and building excitement about the project. | The demonstration also showed some initial effort was made in building excitement about the project. | The demonstration also showed that little effort was made in building excitement about the project. |
| Content & Creativity - TR = 5 points - PoC = 10 points | The demonstration was imaginative and effective in conveying ideas to the audience. | The demonstration techniques used were effective in conveying main ideas, but a bit unimaginative. | The demonstration failed to capture the interest of the audience and/or is confusing in what was communicated. |
| Technical Writing (25/10) | Exceeding Expectations | Meeting Expectations | Approaching Expectations |
| Composition - TR = 25 points - PoC = 10 points | The deliverable was well organized and clearly written. The underlying logic was clearly articulated and easy to follow. Words were chosen that precisely express the intended meaning and support reader comprehension. | The deliverable was organized and clearly written for the most part. In some areas the logic/flow of ideas were difficult to follow. Words were well chosen with some minor exceptions. | The deliverable lacked an overall organization. The reader had to make considerable effort to understand the underlying logic and flow of ideas. |
| | Diagrams or analyses enhance and clarify presentation of ideas. | Diagrams were consistent with the text. | Diagrams were absent or inconsistent with the text. |
| | Sentences are grammatically correct and free from spelling errors. | Sentences were mostly grammatically correct and only a few spelling errors were present, but they do not hinder the reader. | Grammatical and spelling errors made it difficult for the reader to interpret the text in places. |
| Final Presentation (15) | Exceeding Expectations | Meeting Expectations | Approaching Expectations |
| Content & Creativity (5) | The presentation contained an abundance of material which clearly related to the main arguments. | The presentation contained an appropriate amount of material to support the main arguments. The material clearly related to the main arguments. | The audience had to make considerable effort to understand the underlying logic and flow of ideas. |
| | Substantial external research was used to justify arguments or solutions. | External research was used to justify arguments or solutions. | Very little (or no) external research was used to justify arguments or solutions. |
| | The presentation of the material was original and interesting, and presented in a creative way that held audience attention. | The presentation of the material was interesting and creative, and held audience attention. | The presentation lacked creativity and did not hold audience attention. |
| Coherence & Organization (5) Speaking Skills & Style (5) | The thesis, argument, solution, and conclusion were clearly stated, and examples were appropriate. | The thesis, argument and solution were clearly stated. Most (but not all) examples were supportive illustrations; | The thesis, argument, solution and/or conclusion were unclear. |
| | The transitions and flow were easy to follow. | The transitions and/or flow were somewhat difficult to follow | The transitions and flow were not easy to follow. |
| | The presentation and any slides were error- free and logically presented. The audio and any visuals are clear (i.e., | The presentation and any slides were error- free and logically presented. The audio and any visuals are clear (i.e., | Slides contained errors and a lack of logical progression. The audio and any visuals were often inaudible. |
| Speaking Skins & Style (3) | easy to hear and see). | easy to hear and see). Presenter(s) were mostly poised and had | The audio and any visuals were often inaudible and/or hard to see. Presenter(s) could not clearly articulate their |
| | Presenter(s) were poised and had clear articulation. | clear articulation of their topic. | topic. |
| | Presenter(s) spoke and participated at a very high and balanced level. | Presenter(s) spoke and participated at a reasonable and balanced level. | Presenter(s) made distracting on-screen gestures (e.g., moving the mouse around a lot unncessarily). |
| | Enthusiasm and confidence were exuded. | Enthusiasm, and perhaps light discomfort with (pre-recorded) public speaking, was exuded. | Presenter(s) displayed little or no enthusiasm or interest. A high level of discomfort with (prerecorded) public speaking was exuded. |
| | | The presentation fit into the time allotment | The presentation did not make effective use of the alloted time (e.g., very short or very long |