
CSCE774 – Robotics

Fall 2011 – Presentation and Review Guidelines

The second half of this course will consist of student-led discussions of important or interesting published research papers in the field. Each student will be responsible for presenting approximately two papers. A paper list and a presentation schedule will be established after the course enrollment stabilizes.

For the presenter

The presenter of each paper should lead the class in a discussion of the paper, lasting approximately one class period. This should include both a review of the paper's content to ensure that everyone is in agreement about the basic approach, a more open discussion of the algorithms used, and a discussion and critique of the paper's contribution. Note that the audience is expected to have read the paper, but may or may not have understood it completely. A good presentation will often require the presenter to read some of the related work to better understand where the paper fits into the bigger picture, and to evaluate its contribution more accurately. It may be beneficial, but certainly is not required, to discuss the paper with me before your presentation, especially if you are unsure about any aspect.

I expect that most presenters will use PowerPoint (or similar software — for my presentations I use L^AT_EX with powerdot) to prepare slides to guide the discussion. After presenting, email a copy of your slides to me for posting on the course website.

The next page shows the rubric that I'll use to score these presentations. Scores will be posted shortly after all of the presentations are complete. Recall from the syllabus this accounts for 15% of your final grade.

For everyone else: One page summary and critique

Each student other than the presenter of a paper is expected to carefully read the paper before class and submit, at the start of class, a hardcopy review of the paper at least one page in length. The review should contain (at least) these two parts, preferably roughly equal in length:

- **Summary:** What problem is being solved? How is the problem attacked? What assumptions are made? What results does the paper present? Can you see connections to other papers we've read, or to other fields?
- **Critique:** Are the results correct? Are they important? Do the results seem novel? How would you improve the paper? Be specific! What are the next steps you would take if you were doing research on this topic? (Note: Writing that you "liked" or "didn't like" the paper is not a meaningful critique. Try to say something substantive.)

Your goal in writing the review should be to demonstrate that you have read the paper, and that you have thought critically about its contents. Write in your own words, rather than copying "key sentences" from the paper.

Remember that these papers are written for a certain audience, typically for expert roboticists. In particular, it is likely that you are not (yet) a member of the audience to whom the authors are writing. Therefore you should not be surprised if the paper leaves some things unexplained that are new to you.

Reviews cannot be accepted late. This policy is particularly firm for these reviews because their purpose is to ensure that the class is prepared to discuss the paper. Recall from the syllabus that these reviews account for 15% of your final grade. There is no need to submit a review for your own presentations.

Did the presenter ...

CONTENT	Yes	No
... describe the problem and the difficulties associated with solving it?		
... introduce and explain any important new technical concepts used in the paper?		
... demonstrate a thorough, detailed understanding of the technical content?		
... research and describe the most relevant prior and subsequent work?		
... give a meaningful and well-reasoned critique of the paper?		
... succinctly summarize the paper's contribution?		
FORM	Yes	No
... use slides or other means to communicate the paper's content effectively?		
... clearly distinguish important ideas from less important details?		
... seem to be fully prepared?		
DISCUSSION	Yes	No
... actively and effectively generate discussion with the audience?		
SCORE		