ENG-647: Interdisciplinary Seminar Series

Feedback form: details into categories and grading

	5 = excellent	4 = very satisfying	3 = satisfying	2 = partially satisfying	1 = needs improvement
Problem statement	Problem statement is clear, precise, and compelling. There is a strong justification of the problem's relevance and its broader interdisciplinary significance	Problem statement is clear and detailed. Its significance and relevance are explained and supported with appropriate context and examples	Problem statement is clear but lack precision or depth. The relevance of the problem is explained but not completely justified	Problem statement is present but lacks clarity and details. There is an attempt to explain the relevance, but the connection to broader fields or society is not clear	Problem statement is not well defined or missing. The audience cannot understand why the problem is significant or its connections to broader fields or society
Literature review / background information	Thorough and engaging background information is provided, fully adapted and accessible to a diverse audience, clearly establishing the relevance and object of the research. Technical details are integrated while ensuring they are understandable to non-specialists	Comprehensive background information is provided, allowing the audience to understand the relevance and object of the research. Technical terms are consistently explained in lay language	Adequate background information is included and explained in a way that is accessible to most of the audience. Technical terms are mostly explained in lay language	Some background information is provided, but it is overly technical and still mainly understandable only by a specialist audience	There is no or very little background information provided. The background information is not explained to the audience in lay terms. References are missing
Methodology explanation	Methods employed are described precisely and adapted to a diverse scientific audience, regardless of their specific expertise using lay language and describing the relevant acronyms. The explanations allow the audience to fully understand how the methodology aligns with the research goals, as well as its limitations	Explanation of the methodology is clear, detailed and convincing, justifying the methodology employed with clear links to the research questions and goals. The explanation attempts to address potential concerns or limitations of the methods	Methodology is explained clearly and logically with enough detail to give the audience a reasonable understanding of the approach and some effort is made to make the explanation relatable to non-specialists. The connection between methodology and research objectives is present but could be more detailed	Explanation covers some methodological details but lacks sufficient clarity for a diverse audience. Acronyms are detailed but the overall explanation is overly technical. There is limited discussion of how the methodology aligns with the research goals or addresses the problem	There is no or very little explanation of the methodology provided. Key methodology steps are unclear or missing. Acronyms are not detailed. The relevance of the methodology to the research question is not explained

Presentation of results / findings	Results are presented in a clear and accessible manner for a diverse scientific audience, using visual aids and data representation that enhance audience understanding. Results are deeply contextualized, showing a strong connection to the research objectives, with a compelling narrative that keeps the audience interested	Results are presented in a logical, engaging, and accessible way, with clear visual aids and data representations. Findings are contextualized with clear links to research objectives and broader implications in the field	Results are presented clearly, using visual aids and data representations are present that support the verbal explanations. There is some effort to ensure accessibility for a diverse audience, with simplified explanations or context	Some results are presented clearly, but others are unclear or insufficiently explained. Visual aids and data representations are present but lack some explanations. Language used is overly technical and results are not sufficiently linked to the research objectives	Results are presented in a confusing, disorganized, or overly technical manner, so the audience cannot understand the key takeaways. Visual aids are missing or too complex and not explained. Findings are not contextualized within the research objectives
Impact	Presentation very effectively communicates the research's broader implications with strong relevance to broader academic and real-world contexts, communicated in a way that fully engages the audience through connections across multiple fields and inspires further inquiry and collaboration. Visual aids, storytelling, and examples enhance understanding and leave a lasting impression	Presentation communicates the research's broader implications with relevance to broader academic and real-world contexts while engaging the interdisciplinary audience by making meaningful connections between disciplines (at least 1). Visual aids and relevant examples are used to deliver a clear and compelling story	Presentation adequately communicates the research's broader implications, while engaging the interdisciplinary audience by highlighting connections to other fields. Contributions to advancing knowledge or addressing real-world challenges are present but not clearly emphasized enough	Presentation shows some connection between the research and the broader implications, but they are underdeveloped and the relevance of the research to other disciplines is mentioned but not explored in depth. Contributions to knowledge or practical applications are present but not sufficiently detailed	Presentation shows no clear connection between the research and its broader implications to an interdisciplinary audience. Evidence of how the research contributes to solving real-world problems or advancing knowledge is absent