

These rubrics were used by expert reviewers during the 2024 Doctoral Symposium to evaluate **talks (pg 1)** and **poster presentations (pg 2)**. Scores and comments were used to choose outstanding presentation award winners. Rubrics may be updated for the 2025 edition, but these may serve as a reference for submitters.

Speaker:

Talk Session:

Reviewer #

Mark the appropriate box to evaluate the statements in the table:

- 3 pts: Excellent, professional quality, issues are very minor
- 2 pts: Meets expectations, appropriate, some minor issues or limitations
- 1 pts: Needs improvement, moderate issues interfere with clarity of work
- 0 pts: Completely absent or not applicable

Presentation Qualities (review of Talk , not of paper)	Score			
A clear gap in existing knowledge in HPC is identified and addressed with appropriate citations to prior work.	0	1	2	3
The approach is appropriate to address the questions or motivation of the work.	0	1	2	3
The description of the procedures and methods for data collection and/or analysis is complete.	0	1	2	3
Sufficient explanation of technical vocabulary, acronyms, and content make the presentation accessible to an interdisciplinary HPC audience.	0	1	2	3
Explanations are formulated from the evidence and/or the conclusions are valid and supported by data .	0	1	2	3
The work is novel , or a worthwhile confirmation or extension of previous work.	0	1	2	3
The presenter clearly connects all parts of the presentation to each other.	0	1	2	3
The slides contain sufficient visual elements that complement speech to illustrate key points or visualize data.	0	1	2	3
The presenter responds to questions (if any) with relevant information in a way that supports the interdisciplinary HPC audience to understand both question and answer.	0	1	2	3
The talk duration fits within the allotted time limit .	0	1		
The presenter demonstrates the ability to carry out high quality HPC work .	0	1		
Total				

Comments on the strengths of this presentation:

Recommendations to improve this presentation:

Poster Presenter:

Poster Title:

Reviewer #

Mark the appropriate box to evaluate the statements in the table:

- 3 pts: Excellent, professional quality, issues are very minor
- 2 pts: Meets expectations, appropriate, some minor issues or limitations
- 1 pts: Needs improvement, moderate issues interfere with clarity of work
- 0 pts: Completely absent or not applicable

Presentation Qualities (review of Poster , not of paper)	Score			
A clear gap in existing knowledge in HPC is identified and addressed with appropriate citations to prior work.	0	1	2	3
The approach is appropriate to address the questions or motivation of the work.	0	1	2	3
The description of the procedures and methods for data collection and/or analysis is complete.	0	1	2	3
Definitions or illustrations of technical vocabulary and spelling out of acronyms make the poster accessible to an interdisciplinary HPC audience.	0	1	2	3
Explanations are formulated from the evidence and/or the conclusions are valid and supported by data .	0	1	2	3
The work is novel , or a worthwhile confirmation or extension of previous work.	0	1	2	3
The presenter clearly connects different parts of the poster to each other, or relies on multiple visual elements of the poster in conversation with the audience.	0	1	2	3
The poster contains sufficient visual elements to illustrate key points or visualize data.	0	1	2	3
The presenter holds back-and-forth conversation and responds to questions with relevant information in a way that is accessible to the interdisciplinary HPC audience.	0	1	2	3
The poster presentation is free from major problems with format and printing.	0	1		
The presenter demonstrates the ability to carry out high quality HPC work .	0	1		
Total				

Comments on the strengths of this presentation:

Recommendations to improve this presentation: