	CMSC 304 — Paper Pr	resentation Feed	dback				
Evaluator'	s name:						
Rating sca	ale: 1-poor, 2-weak, 3-fair, 4-good, 5-excellent						
Content							
	Clearly described the problem being studied	d í	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Articulated the relevant ethical questions	3	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Stated a clear position on the questions	=	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Justified the position using evidence	2	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Identified appropriate policies/decisions to o	consider 2	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant principles and values	3	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Identified stakeholders and potential consec	quences 2	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant laws	3	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was clear	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was interesting	<u> </u>	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of content	=	1 2	2 3	4	5	
Presenta	tion Style						
	Organized talk well	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Spoke clearly and with sufficient volume	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Maintained good flow (minimal hesitation/fu	mbling) 1	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Visual aids were readable and useful	3	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Was well prepared	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Projected confidence	2	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of presentation style	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	

This space for comments and suggestions.

This space for comments and suggestions.

	CMSC 304 — Paper	Presentation	Feedba	ıck				
Evaluator's name:		Presenter's r	name:					
Rating scale	: 1-poor, 2-weak, 3-fair, 4-good, 5-excelle	ent						
Content	. 1 poor, 2 weak, 6 rair, 4 good, 5 excent	THE STATE OF THE S						
	Clearly described the problem being stud	lied	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Articulated the relevant ethical questions		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
'	Stated a clear position on the questions		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Justified the position using evidence		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified appropriate policies/decisions t	o consider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant principles and values	;	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified stakeholders and potential con	sequences	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant laws		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was clear		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was interesting		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of content		1	2	3	4	5	
Presentation	n Style							
	Organized talk well		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Spoke clearly and with sufficient volume		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Maintained good flow (minimal hesitation	/fumbling)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Visual aids were readable and useful		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Was well prepared		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Projected confidence		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of presentation sty	le	1	2	3	4	5	

	CMSC 304 — Paper Pr	resentation Feed	dback				
Evaluator'	s name:						
Rating sca	ale: 1-poor, 2-weak, 3-fair, 4-good, 5-excellent						
Content							
	Clearly described the problem being studied	d í	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Articulated the relevant ethical questions	3	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Stated a clear position on the questions	=	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Justified the position using evidence	2	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Identified appropriate policies/decisions to o	consider 2	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant principles and values	3	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Identified stakeholders and potential consec	quences 2	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant laws	3	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was clear	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was interesting	<u> </u>	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of content	=	1 2	2 3	4	5	
Presenta	tion Style						
	Organized talk well	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Spoke clearly and with sufficient volume	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Maintained good flow (minimal hesitation/fu	mbling) 1	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Visual aids were readable and useful	3	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Was well prepared	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Projected confidence	2	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of presentation style	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	

This space for comments and suggestions.

This space for comments and suggestions.

	CMSC 304 — Paper	Presentation	Feedba	ıck				
Evaluator's name:		Presenter's r	name:					
Rating scale	: 1-poor, 2-weak, 3-fair, 4-good, 5-excelle	ent						
Content	. 1 poor, 2 weak, 6 rair, 4 good, 5 excent	THE STATE OF THE S						
	Clearly described the problem being stud	lied	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Articulated the relevant ethical questions		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
'	Stated a clear position on the questions		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Justified the position using evidence		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified appropriate policies/decisions t	o consider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant principles and values	;	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified stakeholders and potential con	sequences	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant laws		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was clear		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was interesting		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of content		1	2	3	4	5	
Presentation	n Style							
	Organized talk well		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Spoke clearly and with sufficient volume		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Maintained good flow (minimal hesitation	/fumbling)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Visual aids were readable and useful		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Was well prepared		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Projected confidence		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of presentation sty	le	1	2	3	4	5	

	CMSC 304 — Paper Pr	resentation Feed	dback				
Evaluator'	s name:						
Rating sca	ale: 1-poor, 2-weak, 3-fair, 4-good, 5-excellent						
Content							
	Clearly described the problem being studied	d í	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Articulated the relevant ethical questions	3	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Stated a clear position on the questions	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Justified the position using evidence	2	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Identified appropriate policies/decisions to o	consider 2	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant principles and values	3	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Identified stakeholders and potential consec	quences 2	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant laws	3	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was clear	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was interesting		1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of content	=	1 2	2 3	4	5	
Presenta	tion Style						
	Organized talk well	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Spoke clearly and with sufficient volume	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Maintained good flow (minimal hesitation/fu	mbling) 1	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Visual aids were readable and useful	3	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Was well prepared	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Projected confidence	2	1 2	2 3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of presentation style	-	1 2	2 3	4	5	

This space for comments and suggestions.

This space for comments and suggestions.

	CMSC 304 — Paper	Presentation	Feedba	ıck				
Evaluator's name:		Presenter's r	name:					
Rating scale	: 1-poor, 2-weak, 3-fair, 4-good, 5-excelle	ent						
Content	. 1 poor, 2 weak, 6 rair, 4 good, 5 excent	THE STATE OF THE S						
	Clearly described the problem being stud	lied	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Articulated the relevant ethical questions		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
'	Stated a clear position on the questions		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Justified the position using evidence		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified appropriate policies/decisions t	o consider	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant principles and values	;	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Identified stakeholders and potential con	sequences	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Discussed relevant laws		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was clear		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Presentation was interesting		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of content		1	2	3	4	5	
Presentation	n Style							
	Organized talk well		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Spoke clearly and with sufficient volume		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Maintained good flow (minimal hesitation	/fumbling)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Visual aids were readable and useful		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Was well prepared		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Projected confidence		1	2	3	4	5	N/A
	Overall evaluation of presentation sty	le	1	2	3	4	5	