

Rubric for Presentations
CMSC 828B – Fall 2010
Recent Advances in Biometrics

1. Content **60 Points (10 points each, except as noted)**

- a. Was interesting work with novel ideas chosen for discussion? (If material was suggested by me, did presenter bring in interesting additional material?).
- b. Where necessary, was the background needed to appreciate the papers clearly explained? **(5 points)**
- c. Did the presenter isolate the key, novel and interesting ideas of the paper? Were these explained in a clear and focused manner?
- d. Was there a comprehensive description of the state of the art in performance? How good is current performance? Is there one approach that is clearly performing best? What seems to account for the performance of the best algorithms?
- e. What is the relationship between work in this area and work addressing other biometrics? Is work in this area potentially applicable to other biometrics? Or is it truly specific to this domain? **(5 points)**
- f. Were the most significant unsolved challenges in this domain identified and explained?
- g. Was work viewed critically? Were potential shortcomings pointed out? Were experiments evaluated critically?

2. Explanation of content **24 Points (6 points each)**

- a. Organization. Was presentation focused on key elements of the research? Were ideas presented in a logical sequence that made them easy to understand?
- b. Were equations or algorithms clearly explained?
- c. Were questions answered knowledgeably? Did presenter make sure (s)he understood questions before answering them, and that questions were repeated so that everyone could hear them? Were answers concise and to the point?
- d. Was discussion initiated with intriguing open questions?

3. Presentation **16 Points (4 points each)**

- a. Quality of Powerpoint. Were slides clear and uncluttered, with legible writing? Did slides contain figures, graphs and tables where these might help clarify the material? Were animations used as appropriate? Or did speaker wave at slides where animations might have made them clearer?
- b. Did speaker make eye contact with audience?
- c. Was presentation loud and clear?
- d. Was speaker animated, conveying enthusiasm for the subject (extra points for humor)?