Concordia University
Department of Computer Science
and Software Engineering

Comparative Study of Programming Languages
COMP 6411 --- Winter 2014

Term paper Presentation - Peer Evaluation Report

Evaluator :	Name	Student ID

Evaluated Team :	

Team evaluation score: The professor evaluates the term paper presentation for the team as a whole using the following criteria:

Quality of presentation material	*5*
Amount of Information vs comparison	*5*
Amount of technical information/explanations	*5*
Quality of answers to questions	*3*
Oratory skills	*2*

Individual peer evaluation score: In addition to these 20 marks, which are common and equal for all team members, each individual team member is evaluated individually for an additional 5 marks for his/her individual contribution to the team's presentation, based on a peer evaluation done by the students in the audience.

For each team presentation given by teams other than hers/his, every student in the audience has to fill in a peer evaluation report and submit it at the end of the presentation. All grading reports will then be used to compute the *Individual peer evaluation score* for each individual student. Note that any student failing to submit peer evaluation reports for other teams' presentations will incur loss of grades in his own *Individual peer evaluation score*.

Explanation of criteria:

Quality of presentation material: Quality of the slides used for the presentation or any other material used for the presentation.
Amount of information vs comparison: The project is about comparing programming languages. How much is the presentation enabling you to compare different programming languages?
Amount of technical information/explanations: How much details are given during the presentation that enables you to understand the technical aspects of the programming languages presented and their differences?
Quality of answer to questions: How clear were the answers given?
Oratory skills: How structured, clear, and generally enjoyable was the presentation?

Evaluated Student:	Name:	Student ID:					
Criteria			evaluation (5 = excellent)				
			1	2	3	4	5
Quality of presentation material			○	○	○	○	○
Amount of information vs comparison			○	○	○	○	○
Amount of technical information/explanations			○	○	○	○	○
Quality of answers to questions			○	○	○	○	○
Oratory skills			○	○	○	○	○

Evaluated Student:	Name:	Student ID:					
Criteria			evaluation (5 = excellent)				
			1	2	3	4	5
Quality of presentation material			○	○	○	○	○
Amount of information vs comparison			○	○	○	○	○
Amount of technical information/explanations			○	○	○	○	○
Quality of answers to questions			○	○	○	○	○
Oratory skills			○	○	○	○	○

Evaluated Student:	Name:	Student ID:					
Criteria			evaluation (5 = excellent)				
			1	2	3	4	5
Quality of presentation material			○	○	○	○	○
Amount of information vs comparison			○	○	○	○	○
Amount of technical information/explanations			○	○	○	○	○
Quality of answers to questions			○	○	○	○	○
Oratory skills			○	○	○	○	○

Evaluated Student:	Name:	Student ID:					
Criteria			evaluation (5 = excellent)				
			1	2	3	4	5
Quality of presentation material			○	○	○	○	○
Amount of information vs comparison			○	○	○	○	○
Amount of technical information/explanations			○	○	○	○	○
Quality of answers to questions			○	○	○	○	○
Oratory skills			○	○	○	○	○