Research Paper Presentation:

	You understood the paper (~40%)			You engaged and synthesized content (~30%)		You effectively communicated (~30%)
	PROBLEM MOTIVATION	METHODOLOGY	CONTRIBUTIONS	CONNECTION TO COURSE CONTENT	ANALYSIS / DISCUSSION	PRESENTATION CLARITY
EXPERT (rarely given)	You clearly described compelling and in-depth problem motivation and connect it to the subsequent research and analysis. Your presentation of problem motivation is indistinguishable from that of an HCI researcher, and your depth of reflection demonstrates mastery over the research.	Each methodological detail is accurately described in your presentation. Those methodological details are clearly articulated, use precise terminology, and cite their original source (through links). You have described the methodological decisions to the degree that it would pass scientific peer-review at top publication venues.	Each contribution is clearly and accurately articulated in the presentation. You engage in-depth with discussion on the novelty of the research.	You made beyond-surface-level connections to prior course content and were potentially forward-looking to future content. How the paper relates to the course is clear and represents a comprehensive knowledge.	Your analysis and discussion is comprehensive and goes beyond the open questions described by the authors of the paper. Your analysis and discussion is indistinguishable from that of a published HCI researcher.	The presentation is professional in terms of confident communication and visual quality. By all accounts, the presentation could be mistaken for that of a seasoned researcher at a top-tier HCI venue.
EXCELLENT	You described compelling and in-depth problem motivation. You reflect on this motivation connects to the research, the subsequent discussion and analysis, etc.	Your presentation includes a comprehensive summary of the research methodology. Your terminology is precise and correct, and you demonstrated in-depth understanding.	Your presentation includes a comprehensive and clearly articulated list of contributions for the research.	Connection to course content is strong and clear. References to course content are explicit and described in-depth.	Analysis and critique of the work is strong, reflecting a complete understanding of the research. You describe open questions or items for discussion.	The presentation clearly demonstrates your understanding of the research, but may have audio/visual indicators that this was not professionally constructed. Still, the presentation is compelling with good production quality.
GOOD	You described reasonable problem motivation, but the level of detail leaves something to be desired. Important aspects of your problem motivation may be glossed over or may be clearly rushed.	Your presentation includes a reasonable summary of the research methodology. You may be missing some key details or lack depth.	Your presentation includes contributions. You may be missing some details or otherwise lack completeness or depth.	How the research relates to the course content is present, but there is room for improvement. The presentation of this connection may lack some depth, or it may not explicitly refer to topics we covered.	You provide some critique of the work and describe remaining open questions. This analysis may be lack adequate depth or contain some inaccuracies.	Delivery of the presentation was good, but there is room for improvement. You may not communicate it in the clearest way possible verbally. Visuals are present but may not be clear or clearly relevant.
DEVELOPING	A significant component of the problem motivation may be missing.	Your presentation may be lacking significant components of the research methodology.	Your description of the contributions is limited. It may be lacking some contributions.	The engagement with course content is limited. It may be spotty and lacking significant connections.	There may be some preliminary thoughts on the quality or validity of the work or questions it inspired, but they are not fully developed. They may reflect a misunderstanding of the research.	The narrative may not be fully developed or may be missing components. There may be some visuals. The presentation was clearly rushed.
NEEDS MORE TIME	Presentation is incomplete. Little to no problem motivation.	There is little to no description of methodology. At best, there is brief mention of the steps.	There is little to no description of the contributions the paper makes. At most, there is a brief mention.	There is little to no evidence that the readings/lectures have been incorporated into this assignment. At best, there are loose references.	There is little to no analysis or discussion about the paper. At most, there may be some deficient analyses.	The presentation lacked visuals or adequate written or verbal communication, making it barely discernible.
MISSING	No problem motivation.	No methodology described.	No contributions described.	No connection to course content.	No analysis or discussion.	Lack of clarity in the presentation prevented any understanding of the research.

HOW TO INTERPRET THIS RUBRIC: By the end of the semester, my goal is for you to be consistently achieving the *Excellent* row in the rubric. This roughly corresponds to A quality work. *Good* roughly corresponds to B quality work. The top row - *Expert* - is given only for truly extraordinary quality and effort (very, very rarely). The weighting for the dimensions are listed above the columns.