Text Analysis Interest Group Presentation Competition Scoring

**JUDGE NAME: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (will be kept confidential – for ID purposes only)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Poster # | Title and Presenter | Technical Content | | Presentation | Overall Score |
| Quality of Content | Potential Impact | Clarity, Visual, Quality |
|  |  | **1 2 3 4 5** | **1 2 3 4 5** | **1 2 3 4 5** |  |
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**Evaluation rubrics**

1. Quality of technical content
   1. Is sufficient information provided to understand each of the research question/problem, the approach, and the results?
   2. Does the methodology used address the research question posed?
   3. Is this methodology defensible? If there are any mathematical derivations, do they appear to be technically correct?
   4. Does this work relate well to the existing body of knowledge in text mining / NLP?
   5. Are the appropriate references cited? Are references comprehensive?
   6. Does conclusion address the study question? Are conclusions supported by the results?
   7. Are limitations of the work acknowledged and discussed?
2. Potential impact of technical content
   1. Is the problem presented in the poster specific to that particular project, or is it generalizable to other projects?
   2. Will the technical materials, including software code, be shared?
   3. How easy/difficult will it be for somebody else to pick up this methodology and reproduce/apply in their projects?
   4. Are you interested enough to ask for a copy of the presentation/paper for your own use, or to refer anybody to it?
3. Clarity, visual quality of presentation
   1. Is the presentation appealing to the eye?
   2. For posters: Is the space of the poster used efficiently? Are parts of the poster logically arranged?
   3. Are the colors and fonts used working well together?
   4. Is the flow of presentation easy to follow?
   5. Is the length/amount of material appropriate?
   6. Are there any typos, unreadable symbols, formatting problems?
   7. Have you learned any *presentation* ideas from this?
4. Overall score is the sum of the three components.

Please include any impressions from your one-on-one interaction with the presenter, if you had any.

**Tentative scores**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| No attempt | Basic, with multiple gaps | Developing | Competent | Exemplary |