

Rubric for Data Science Colloquium (INFOMCDASC)

Criterion Grade	Insufficient 4	Needs improvement 5	Just sufficient 6	Ample sufficient 7	Good 8	Very good 9	Excellent 10
Presentation (75%)							
Scientific depth (15%)	The content is no more than a summary of the bibliography, without any new connections or insight added. Content describes only methods and approaches instead of results and conclusions or the reverse.		The content lacks depth and coherence because little new insight is added. Lots of irrelevant material is presented without context or connection. Argumentation is mostly logical, but lacks depth or organisation.		Topic is properly placed into context. The content shows good attempts at defining new connections (e.g., categorising) and giving insight into the subject matter.		The content is well described, and all information presented is relevant to the story and placed into the story. The new connections and insights from the author show an excellent grasp of the topic and the field.
Description of literature (10%)	Content is incorrectly described or confusing for the reader. It is not clear which statements are from which source and what is the author's own opinion or interpretation.		Multiple descriptions contain mistakes or miss steps that would make the content more understandable. Results and conclusions from sources are taken as true, without critical reflection. References are discussed one by one rather than integrated into a coherent story.		Results and conclusions from sources are mostly used effectively, but explanations could be improved by some additions or are unnecessarily repetitive. The critical evaluation of published results and conclusions can be improved.		Results and conclusions from sources are perfectly integrated into the text. Student displays a balanced critical view on all published material.
Selection of source materials (10%)	References include unsuitable non-scientific materials. Bibliography contains way too many or very few sources.		Obvious gaps in the choice of source materials, for example lacking in recent publications or including many irrelevant sources. Topic is much too broad or narrow.		Bibliography would benefit from several extra or different sources.		Chosen sources are a perfect representation of the history and the state of the art of the topic.
Scientific level (10%)	Scientific content is incorrectly presented or misses important aspects or references. Student does not critically evaluate their statements. Not all conclusions are well-founded.		Mostly appropriate material is presented. Some information is unclear or incorrect. Content does not build upon existing literature but only summarises.		Appropriate and relevant material is presented and placed into a broader perspective. Student addresses the 'bigger picture' but misses some key considerations.		Abundant relevant material and literature is presented accurately and expanded upon, showing the student understands the scientific field at an expert level.
Lay-out (10%)	Slide layout is unprofessional or does not support the message. Contains multiple issues from the following list: - too much text or long sentences - too much information per slide (text and visuals) - illegible graphs, text or other visuals due to font, colour or size - distracting animations - no slide numbers, titles or references - spelling or grammar errors		Slide layout is not optimal but does not distract from the presentation. Notably, the overall quality of the layout of the slides is mixed with inappropriate use of text, tables, graphs, and graphics in some places. Some mistakes as specified in the box at 'insufficient'.		Slides are mostly well-designed for the purpose and support the message with appropriate use of text, tables, graphs, and graphics. Some changes could have made the slides even better, as specified in the box at 'excellent'.		Slides support the story and contain: - one main message per slide - bullet points - legible text and visuals - slide numbers - clear references - only functional animations - good slide titles Slides are professional and appealing to look at with a uniform design.

Criterion Grade	Insufficient 4	Needs improvement 5	Just sufficient 6	Ample sufficient 7	Good 8	Very good 9	Excellent 10
Message (structure, timing, appropriateness of level for audience) (10%)	Only a few members of the audience can follow the presentation. Sections are not well balanced; many are too easy or difficult or their relevance to the story is not explained. The order of the presentation is not good, which makes the story more difficult to follow. Presentation is too long or too short.		The majority of students and staff can follow the main plotline of the story. All components are discussed in a logical order, but some links are missing or the division of time between the different sections is not ideal. Major points could have benefitted from more time.		The main message is mentioned. The audience can reproduce parts of the presentation afterwards. The presentation brings forth a good discussion. Student has made good choices on what to present and what to leave out. Overall timing is good with all elements well-balanced.		The main message is clear and the whole presentation is logically connected. The presentation storyline has a logical build-up, allows the whole audience to follow along and remember it afterwards and starts a substantive discussion. All necessary elements are present and receive a balanced amount of time. Presentation is the correct length.
Presentation skills (verbal and non-verbal) (10%)	Student does not show interest in or evoke enthusiasm about the topic presented. Speaks unclearly or in unfinished sentences. Has some eye contact with audience, but much of the presentation is read from notes or too obviously memorised. Movements are absent or distracting.		Student has difficulty inspiring enthusiasm about the topic presented. Sometimes speaks too quietly for a majority of the audience to understand. Needs notes almost every slide to keep on track. Involvement of movement and descriptive gestures in a way that helps the story. Student has trouble recovering from mistakes.		Student demonstrates a clear, positive feeling about topic during most of the presentation and evokes the same from the audience. Uses a clear voice and mostly speaks at a good pace. Has regular eye contact with audience, but also regularly looks at notes or talks to slides. Movements are mostly helpful for visualising the content. Student recovers well from any small mistake.		Student projects enthusiasm about topic. Uses a clear voice and speaks at a good pace. Uses sentence stress effectively to place emphasis on important words or phrases, and has logical transitions between sections. Has direct eye contact with audience, rarely looking at notes. Movements help the audience visualise. Smooth without errors.
Evaluation (20%)							
Reflection on presentation (10%)	Identified only a few weaknesses in the presentation, with minimal insight or understanding of their impact on the overall quality.		Recognized most significant weaknesses in the presentation, showing a fair level of critical evaluation.		Accurately pinpointed all notable weaknesses, demonstrating thorough understanding and reflection on the areas for improvement.		Not only identified all significant weaknesses, but also analyzed their impact on the takeaway message and effectiveness of the presentation, thus showing deep awareness.
Reflection on research (5%)	Only some possible weaknesses indicated and/or points at weaknesses which are in reality irrelevant.		Most weaknesses in the research indicated, but their impact on the main results are not weighed relative to each other.		All weaknesses in the research indicated and their impact on the main results are weighed relative to each other.		All possible weaknesses in the research indicated, and weaknesses affecting the conclusions most identified.
English (5%)	Many spelling, grammar and punctuation errors distract the reader. Awkward constructions force the reader to slow down or reread.		Some errors that affect comprehension. Structure of writing does not flow well.		Only minor errors in grammar, punctuation or spelling that do not affect comprehension. Some transitions or links are missing or feel forced, but the sequence of sentences and paragraphs is clear and logical.		Easy-to-read text with good flow. Almost no errors in grammar, punctuation or spelling.
Documentation (5%)							
All Material Provided (e.g., presentation slides, source code) (5%)	FALSE					TRUE	