

School of ITEE
CSSE7013 Advanced Computer Architecture
Project Presentation Mark Scheme
Semester 2, 2005

A few points to note:

1. Timing is important: not only do you need to get in the content you need to convey, but you should not rush the talk to fit it in, spend too much time on one aspect, go over time, or talk for too little time. ***A good talk in < 15 minutes is harder than a good talk in 30 minutes.***
2. You need to show that you have developed something beyond the original question.
3. It is important to show what you have achieved or plan to do and how it advances the original project.
4. Achievement is measured relative to the stage of the project: for the proposal talk, you need to show understanding of the problem and that you have a viable approach to it (ideally by doing some of it); for the final talk, the amount done towards the final paper will be the basis for evaluation.

Your talk could follow an outline of the following form (other options are possible):

1. Introduction
what you are doing, why and what the approach is
structure of talk
2. Background
terminology, applicable concepts
related work (literature review)
3. Approach to problem
style of evaluation (simulation, or whatever applies; strategies; problems and how they were overcome)
measurements planned
success measure(s)
4. Results (*final presentation only*)
deliverables and how they address the original problem
measurements, comparisons
or
Plan (*proposal presentation*)
deliverables and how they address the original problem
planned measurements, comparisons
time plan (dates and duration's)
5. Conclusions (*less detail in first presentation*)
summary
significance of findings
potential future work

Mark Sheet: CSSE7013 Project presentation

presenter's name:			Title:					
grade band	presentation, slides 20%:		topic development 20%		results/plan 20%		overall impression/achievement 40%	
excellent (85-100%)	clear slides, speaks well, fitted to time (15 min with questions), no doubt about content, logical structure	20	clear fit to topic, good additions to basic spec, clear where it's gone	20	clear results/plan, clear how they were/will be achieved, well backed up by content of talk	20	significant advance on basic problem spec, clear idea of what to do, good implementation	40
		19		19		19		38
		18		18		18		36
		17		17		17		34
very good (75-84%)	clear slides, speaks reasonably well, reasonable fit to time, little doubt about content, reasonable structure	16	reasonable fit to topic, reasonable additions to basic spec, clear where it's gone	16	clear results/plan, reasonably clear how the were/will be achieved, reasonably backed up by content of talk	16	reasonable advance on basic problem spec, reasonable idea of what to do, reasonable implementation	33
		15		15		15		32
								31
good (65-74%)	reasonable slides, speaks reasonably, fair fit to time, content reasonably clear, reasonable structure	14	fair fit to topic, fair additions to basic spec, reasonably clear where it's gone	14	reasonably clear results/plan, some idea how they were/will be achieved, somewhat backed up by content of talk	14	fair advance on basic problem spec, fair idea of what to do, adequate implementation	29
		13		13		13		28
								27
satisfactory (50-64%)	fair slides, hard to follow speech, timing not ideal, content could be clearer, fair structure	12	some fit to topic, some additions to basic spec, somewhat clear where it's gone	12	unclear results/plan, unclear how they were/will be achieved, somewhat backed up by content of talk	12	fair advance on basic problem spec, some idea of what to do, barely adequate implementation	25
		11		11		11		24
		10		10		10		23
poor (25-49%)	inadequate slides, speaks poorly, poor fit to time, significant doubt about content, poor structure	9	little fit to topic, few additions to basic spec, not clear where it's gone	9	unclear results/plan, unclear how they were/will be achieved, not backed up by content of talk	9	little advance on basic problem spec, little idea of what to do, little implementation	19
		8		8		8		16
		7		7		7		14
		6		6		6		12
		5		5		5		10
very poor (0-24%)	poor slides, speaks poorly, bad fit to time, content makes little sense, no obvious structure	4	no/minimal fit to topic, inadequate additions to basic spec, not at all clear where it's gone	4	unclear results/plan, unclear how they were/will be achieved, no relation to content of talk	4	no significant advance on basic problem spec, very little idea of what to do, no implementation	9
		3		3		3		8
		2		2		2		6
		1		1		1		4
		0		0		0		2
TOTAL	/100	Date:	general comments:					