

Masters Committee
for the Robotics M.S. Program

Student s Name: _____

Date of entry to the M.S. Program: _____

To complete the M.S. curriculum, the student must form a Masters Committee consisting of two faculty members and one Robotics Ph.D. student who has completed his or her second year of study. The committee should include the student's advisor and a second faculty member from a different research group or project than that of the student. The following forms are to verify completion of the speaking and writing presentation of the supervised, and must be filled out by the Masters Committee.

The Masters Committee must be formed by the end of the student's first semester.

Faculty Member #1:

Printed Name: _____ Date _____

Signature: _____

Faculty Member #2:

Printed Name: _____ Date _____

Signature: _____

Student Member:

Printed Name: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____

Student Name: _____

Student Year: _____

SPEAKING PRESENTATION

The speaking presentation is designed to examine the student's ability to effectively communicate research material in an oral presentation. Presenting is a vital part of a student's research abilities, and we want to ensure that students can be successful advocates of their own research and robotics as a whole.

Satisfying this qualifier requires that each of the student's Masters Committee members attend and positively evaluate a public seminar or presentation given solely by the student, either within CMU or at a conference. A committee member may appoint a proxy evaluator.

In order for the student to qualify, all of the questions on this form must be answered by each member of the student's committee. The committee member should use his or her own judgement in determining whether the student has demonstrated sufficient speaking ability.

General Questions:

Each of these high-level questions discuss, in broad strokes, the quality of the presentation. For each question, circle a rating, on the scale from excellent to unsatisfactory, and provide at least one sentence of explanation. For each question, the form provides a set of minimum guidelines, but as a committee member, you should use your judgement, as well.

1. **Organization:** The student must be able to present technical material in a clear and concise manner, with scope appropriate to a technical audience.
- Did the presentation have a distinct introduction, body, and conclusion?
 - Did the presentation include an appropriate balance of introduction, background, research content, and future work?
 - Did the speaker have a coherent, memorable take-home message?
 - Did the speaker anticipate the natural questions and concerns about the nature and motivation of the work?
 - Was the technical content adequately explained?

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Explanation: _____

2. **Knowledge and Understanding:** The student must have a good command of the material being presented and the related supporting material.
- Was the student able to give clear explanations that went beyond the material included in the presentation?
 - Was the student able to succinctly answer questions that asked for clarification of the material presented?
 - Was the student able to answer questions about background research or topics closely related to the material presented?

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Explanation: _____

3. **Speaking Skill:** The student should speak clearly, act maturely, and present himself or herself in a professional manner.
- Was the speaker present and prepared to begin on time?
 - Did the speaker appear well prepared (e.g., no typos, slides in order, presentation timed correctly, etc.)?
 - Was the presentation (English and pronunciation) clear?
 - Were there any significant style deficiencies in the presentation (excessive "ums" and "uhs", distracting gestures or fidgeting, blocking the projector).
 - Did the speaker highlight and successfully convey the take-home message?

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Explanation: _____

4. Audience Interaction: The speaker must deal with the audience in a friendly and facile manner.
- Did the speaker strive to keep the audience interested?
 - Did the speaker anticipate problems that the audience might have (i.e., "At this point, you might think that X, but actually...", "The real point of that last example was...")?
 - Did the speaker coordinate the oral presentation with the material on the slides by making clear what printed material was being described?
 - Did the speaker understand and adequately respond to all audience questions?

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Explanation: _____

5. Audio-Visual Quality:
- Was the speaker delayed or in any way hampered by not having previously checked and understood the A/V equipment?
 - Is the smallest font used in the presentation effortlessly visible from all parts of the room?
 - Were any of the transparencies cluttered or difficult to read?
 - Did color schemes or visual bells and whistles on the slides distract from the presentation?

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Explanation: _____

Big Picture Questions:

6. Provide a one sentence summary of the student's research topic.

7. List three specific strengths of the student's presentation.

8. List three specific weaknesses of the student's presentation.

Over all, how would you rate the student's presentation?

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Explanation: _____

This student **HAS SATISFIED** the speaking requirement.

Committee Member Name: _____

Date: _____

Committee Member Signature: _____

Student Name: _____

Student Year: _____

WRITING PRESENTATION

Writing is a vital part of a student's research abilities, and we want to ensure that students can be successful advocates of their own research and robotics as a whole. The writing qualifier is designed to examine the student's ability to effectively communicate research material in written forms appropriate for technical audiences. Effective writing includes effective graphics and captions that are integrated with the text and that can be scanned for the gist of the document without reading the text in detail.

Achieving "qualified" status requires that each of the student's committee members read and positively evaluate a research report for which the student is the primary author.

In order for the student to qualify, all of the questions on this form must be answered by each member of the Masters Committee. The committee member should use his or her own judgement in determining whether the student has sufficient writing ability to enable researchers in the student's field to comprehend the work readily.

General Questions:

Each of these high-level questions discuss, in broad strokes, the quality of the presentation. For each question, circle a rating, on the scale from excellent to unsatisfactory, and provide at least one sentence of explanation. For each question, the form provides a set of minimum guidelines, but as a committee member, you should use your judgment, as well.

1. **Organization:** The student must be able to present the material in a clear, concise manner, with a scope appropriate to the audience.
- Did the document include an appropriate balance of introduction, background, research content, conclusions, and preview of future work -- including presentation graphics and references, appropriate for the document type?
 - Was the document sectioning clear, uniform, and sufficiently detailed to give the reader a precise overview of the document and clear road signs as to where he or she was in it at any particular time?
 - Did the conclusions clearly delineate among the results conclusively proven by the research reported, interesting possibilities suggested by the research reported but not yet conclusively proven, and the author's speculations as to where the research might lead given additional breakthroughs and resources, etc?
 - After reading the paper could the reader independently generate the writer's keyword list?
 - Did the writer anticipate and address all of the natural questions and concerns about the nature and motivation of the work?

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Explanation: _____

2. **Writing style:** The student should write clearly, use appropriate language, and present himself or herself in a professional manner neither too stodgy nor too colloquial.
- Was the language and style appropriate and professional?
 - Did the writer leave a good impression by paying scrupulous attention to document formatting, sizing and location of graphics, grammar, punctuation, and spelling?
 - Did the writer credit predecessors, competitors, and collaborators with appropriate acknowledgements in the text, citations, and acknowledgements section per se?

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Explanation: _____

3. Engaging the reader:

- Did the title clearly inform the reader of the topic and the nature of the work reported (e.g., whether it is theory or experiment).
- Did the abstract provide an accurate synopsis, and appropriate enticements to make the reader want to read the article?
- Did the writer keep the reader interested?
- Did the writer anticipate problems that the reader might have and address them with appropriate use of cross references, citations, footnotes, and appendices?

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Explanation: _____

Big Picture Questions:

4. Provide a one sentence summary of the document's topic.

5. Provide a one sentence description of the document's intended audience.

6. List three specific strengths of the document.

7. List three specific weaknesses of the document.

Over all, how would you rate the document for the intended audience?

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Explanation: _____

This student **HAS SATISFIED** the writing requirement.

Committee Member Name: _____

Date: _____

Committee Member Signature: _____