

ECE 590 Presentation/Discussion Rubric

Grade: ____/40 Names: _____ Paper: _____

Date: _____

Components	8-Sophisticated	6-Competent	2-Not yet Competent
<i>Presentation</i> Depth of Content	Speaker <i>acts as an expert</i> on the article provides accurate and complete explanations of key concepts and theories, drawing on outside sources if appropriate. Listeners gain insights.	For the most part, speaker provides explanations of concepts that are accurate and complete. Some helpful applications/insights are included.	Explanations of concepts and/or theories are inaccurate or incomplete. Listeners gain little from the presentation.
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.
Paper Criticism	Provides insightful and correct commentary on the quality of the work, including highlighting valuable ideas and problematic aspects of the work. Discusses consequences for future work in the area. Goes beyond content provided in the paper.	Provides some insightful commentary, but not to the degree of "sophisticated." The criticisms may be largely found in the paper, or may be general to much of the literature in the area.	Criticism is shallow, trivial, invalid, and/or missing.
<i>Discussion Lead</i>	Has prepared deep questions to spark discussion or debate about the work. Leads and sustains a lively discussion that encourages and builds on the contributions of fellow classmates.	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.

Components	4-Sophisticated	3-Competent	1-Not yet Competent
<i>Time Management</i>	Completes presentation smoothly in time allotted, even in the face of significant distractions or other extenuating	Presentation is completed on time but may be slightly rushed at the end. Presentation may run	Presentation skips important topics due to time and/or presentation exceeds limit by

	circumstances.	slightly over time.	several minutes.
<i>Responsiveness to Audience</i> Verbal Interaction Body Language	Consistently clarifies, restates, and responds to questions. Summarizes when needed. Body language reflects comfort interacting with audience	Generally responsive to audience questions and needs. Misses some opportunities for interaction. Body language reflects some discomfort interacting with audience.	Responds to questions inadequately. Body language reveals a reluctance to interact with audience.
<i>Organization</i> <i>Style</i>	Presentation is clear, logical, and organized. Listener can follow line of reasoning. Level of presentation is appropriate for the audience. Presentation is a planned conversation, paced for audience understanding. It is not a reading of a paper. Speaker is comfortable in front of the group and can be heard by all.	Presentation is generally clear and well organized. A few minor points may be confusing. Level of presentation is generally appropriate. Pacing is sometimes too fast or too slow. Presenter seems slightly uncomfortable at times, and audience occasionally has trouble hearing him/her.	Organization is haphazard; listener can follow presentation only with effort. Arguments are not clear. Aspects of presentation are too elementary or too sophisticated for audience. Presenter seems uncomfortable and can be heard only if listener is very attentive. Much of the information is read.
<i>Presentation Aids</i>	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 main points 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.

Adapted from the Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence, Carnegie Mellon University, who adapted it from Huba, M.E., & Freed, J.E. (2000). *Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning* (pp. 156-157). Allyn & Bacon: Needham Heights, MA

ECE 590 Weekly Discussion Question Rubric

Scoring Level	Interpretation
Accomplished	Analyzes insightful questions Refutes bias Critiques content Examines inconsistencies Values information
Competent	Asks insightful questions Detects bias Categorizes content Identifies inconsistencies Recognizes context
Developing	Identifies some questions Notes some bias Recognizes basic content States some inconsistencies Selects sources adequately
Beginner	Fails to question data Ignores bias Misses major content areas Detects no inconsistencies Chooses biased sources

ECE 590 Research Project Rubric

For the midpoint check-in, only rows **introduction + research methods** will be evaluated. For the final paper, all rows will be evaluated. Adapted from [here](#)

Criteria	Expert=4	Proficient=3	Apprentice=2	Novice=1
Introduction [Introductory paragraph(s), literature review, hypotheses or propositions]	Clearly identifies and discusses research focus/purpose of research. Research focus is clearly grounded in previous research/theoretically relevant literature. Significance of the research is clearly identified (how it adds to previous research). Hypotheses/propositions are clearly articulated	Limited discussion of research focus/purpose of research. Research focus is less well-grounded in previous research/theoretically relevant literature. Significance of the research is not as clearly identified (how it adds to previous research). Hypotheses/propositions are described but not as well articulated	Minimal discussion of research focus/purpose of research. Research focus is not well-grounded in previous research/theoretically relevant literature. Significance of the research is not clearly identified (how it adds to previous research). Hypotheses/propositions are not well articulated	Little or no discussion of research focus/purpose of research. Research focus not grounded in previous research/theoretically relevant literature. Significance of the research is not identified (how it adds to previous research). Hypotheses/propositions are poorly articulated or are absent altogether
Research Methods	Asks questions that focus on potential information gaps or on innovative reexamination of existing problems or issues that are open and unresolved. Algorithmic or analytical contributions are novel and foundational. Provides accurate, thorough description of how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, plan of analysis or measurement instrument, research context	Asks questions that focus on potential information gaps or on innovative reexamination of existing problems or issues that are open and unresolved. Algorithmic or analytical contributions are novel. Description of how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, plan of analysis or measurement instrument, research context is adequate but limited.	Asks questions that explore known or common problems or issues that are open or unresolved. Algorithmic or analytical contributions are somewhat novel. Description of how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, plan of analysis or measurement instrument, research context is somewhat confusing/not clearly articulated.	Asks questions that are simple or obvious, depending upon basic reporting of factual knowledge; or states position without asking question. No algorithmic or analytical contributions. Description of how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, plan of analysis or measurement instrument, research context is very confusing/not articulated sufficiently.

Results	Results are clearly explained in a comprehensive level of detail and are well-organized Tables/figures clearly and concisely convey the data. Statistical analyses (if used) are appropriate tests and are accurately interpreted.	Results are explained but not as clearly, level of detail is not as sufficient, and there are some organizational issues Tables/figures are not as clear/concise in conveying the data. Statistical analyses (if used) are appropriate tests but are not accurately interpreted.	Results are not very clearly explained, level of detail is insufficient, and there are more organizational issues Tables/figures are not clear/concise in conveying the data. Statistical analyses (if used) are inappropriate tests and/or are not accurately interpreted.	Results are not clearly explained, level of detail is severely insufficient, and there are serious organizational issues Tables/figures are not clear/concise in conveying the data. Statistical analyses (if used) are inappropriate tests and/or are not accurately interpreted.
Conclusions	Interpretations/ analysis of results are thoughtful and insightful, are clearly informed by the study's results, and thoroughly address how they supported, refuted, and/or informed the hypotheses/ propositions Insightful discussion of how the study relates to and/or enhances the present scholarship in this area Suggestions for further research in this area are insightful and thoughtful	Interpretations/ analysis of results are sufficient but somewhat lacking in thoughtfulness and insight, are not as clearly informed by the study's results, and do not as thoroughly address how they supported, refuted, and/or informed the hypotheses/ proposition Discussion of how the study relates to and/or enhances the present scholarship in this area is adequate. Suggestions for further research in this area are adequate.	Interpretations/ analysis of results lacking in thoughtfulness and insight, are not clearly informed by the study's results, and do not adequately address how they supported, refuted, and/or informed the hypotheses/ propositions Discussion of how the study relates to and/or enhances the present scholarship in this area is limited. Suggestions for further research in this area are very limited.	Interpretations/ analysis of results severely lacking in thoughtfulness and insight, are not informed by the study's results, and do not address how they supported, refuted, and/or informed the hypotheses/ propositions Discussion of how the study relates to and/or enhances the present scholarship in this area is severely limited and/or absent altogether. Suggestions for further research in this area are severely limited and/or absent altogether.
Documentation of Sources, Quality of Sources	Cites all data obtained from other sources. Sources are all scholarly and clearly relate to the research focus.	Cites most data obtained from other sources. Sources are primarily scholarly and relate to the research focus.	Cites some data obtained from other sources. Sources are not primarily scholarly and relate to the research focus but somewhat tangentially.	Does not cite sources. Sources are disproportionately non-scholarly and do not clearly relate to the research focus.

Spelling & Grammar	No spelling & grammar mistakes	Minimal spelling & grammar mistakes	Noticeable spelling and grammar mistakes	Excessive spelling and/or grammar mistakes
-------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	--