

APPENDIX A. ASSESSMENT RUBRICS FOR POSTERS AND ORAL PRESENTATIONS

For Assessment of Posters

Literature Review	Sufficiency of Poster Content	Poster Design and Clarity
Base Score: 3.5 +/- Modifier: Total: /5	Base Score: 3.5 +/- Modifier: Total: /5	Base Score: 3.5 +/- Modifier: Total: /5
+1.5: Extensive and in-depth review of a quality suitable for a peer reviewed journal.	+1.5: Professional level analysis of data and discussions, suitable for actual conferences.	+1.5: Clear, structured and systematic flow of discussion with excellent analyses and conclusion.
+1.0: Extensive review, show casing several suitable new articles on latest developments.	+1.0: Wide range of results in with succinct and concise analyses and discussions.	+1.0: Showed integration of results to form a coherent presentation of the topic.
+0.5: Review resulted in some articles which may or may not be suitable.	+0.5: Good motivation and appropriate discussions and conclusions.	+0.5: Clear presentation of results, analyses and discussions.
+0.0: Performed the review and found one new article which may or may not be suitable.	+0.0: Covered essential results with average analyses and discussions.	+0.0: Average clarity of presentation, poster conforms to specifications.
-1.0: Performed the review but were unable to find any new articles	-1.0: Insufficient and/or poor quality of analyses and discussions, too few results presented.	-1.0: Poor or lack of figures, lack of figure captions, unreadable axes, no references.
-2.0: Did not perform the review	-2.0: Displayed poor effort, little or no original analyses or discussions.	-2.0: Displayed poor effort, widespread typos or formatting errors, unstructured content, confusing.

For Assessment of Individual Oral Presentations

Overall Understanding (including Q/A)	Content Covered During Presentation	Clarity of Oral Presentation
Base Score: 3.5 +/- Modifier: Total: / 5	Base Score: 3.5 +/- Modifier: Total: /5	Base Score: 3.5 +/- Modifier: Total: /5
+1.5: Expert-level understanding with firm grasp of technicality and assumptions.	+1.5: Expert-level analysis of underlying assumptions and technicalities.	+1.5: Outstanding and professional presentation, of a standard suitable for actual conferences.
+1.0: Displayed understanding beyond course content with good Q/A response.	+1.0: Good coverage of all results and limitations, coherent and systematic flow of discussion.	+1.0: Very clear articulation, systematic and structured presentation.
+0.5: Displayed good understanding but not beyond course content.	+0.5: Essential results are covered with some discussions on limitations or technicalities.	+0.5: Clear presentation, easy to understand.
+0.0: Average, attempts at answering questions only with prompts and hints during Q/A.	+0.0: Only essential results covered with average motivation, discussions and conclusion.	+0.0: Average presentation and clarity, with room for improvement in articulation and coherence of presentation.
-1.0: Poor understanding of concepts even at course level, poor Q/A even with hints and prompts.	-1.0: Did not or unable to cover essential results, little or poor motivation and discussions.	-1.0: Unclear articulation and explanation, messy and incoherent structure of presentation.
-2.0: Completely wrong in conceptual understanding, no grasp of course concepts.	-2.0: Main result omitted, severely insufficient motivation, discussions and/or conclusion.	-1.5: Reading word for word off the screen while facing away from the class the entire time, incomprehensible presentation.