

Applied Formal Methods: Professor's Presentation Evaluation Form

Professor Kristin Yvonne Rozier

1. Did the presentation address the following aspects of the paper in the presentation?

- [5] (a) What was the motivation given for the work? What problem was being solved or question was being answered?
- [5] (b) What was the product of the paper? How was the paper novel and what did it contribute to the field? What tools were used, problems were solved, and artifacts were created?
- [5] (c) Is the work in the paper *reproducible*,¹ i.e. are all of the necessary artifacts available to redo the study, including any models, specifications, theorems, code, data, benchmarks, or other instruments used to complete the study described in the paper.

¹For further reference on how exactly to define reproducibility, correctness, and buildability, please refer to: Rozier, Kristin Yvonne, and Rozier, Eric. "Reproducibility, Correctness, and Buildability: the Three Principles for Ethical Public Dissemination of Computer Science and Engineering Research," In IEEE International Symposium on Ethics in Engineering, Science, and Technology, Ethics2014, May 23-24, 2014.

[5] (d) Is the work in the paper *correct*, i.e. did the authors specifically address how that they know their work is correct or provide any evidence of correctness such as a proof or a comparison to known results?

[5] (e) Is the work in the paper *buildable*, i.e. is the foundation laid in such a way that others in the future would be able to build on it, extend it, and utilize the results in a meaningful way to accomplish a different project?

[5] (f) Is there future work? This can include both future work listed in the paper and ideas the student has for extending the work.

-
- [10] 2. Did the presentation accurately overview the paper and the work presented therein, given the time limit? Did the student make an effort to fully understand the material and explain, if some piece is missing or not understandable, why that is the case?

- [20] 3. Was the presentation clear? Did the student make an effort to present the materials clearly and instructively, not necessarily in the order of the paper? Did the student draw on additional sources to fill out the information and background knowledge required to understand the paper? Did the student draw figures or create ways of presenting the material clearly and fully aside from simply pasting in artifacts from the paper?

-
- [15] 4. Did the student adequately cover background information and related work in an effort to enable him/herself as well as the class to understand the material being presented? Examples of doing this well might include the student reading and including material from some of the paper's citations or manuals for the tools used or otherwise including related background information to aid understanding of the material presented in the paper. These papers are short (usually about 15 pages) snapshots of single projects in formal methods and are meant to be read by practitioners familiar with the field and so usually do not include sufficient background information in the main text.