

AI211 Project Report Rubrics

Class	Rubric	Evaluation Criterion		
		Excellent (100%)	Satisfactory (50%)	Poor (0%)
Report (14 points)	Originality (2 points)	Completely original write up with no complete sentences copied from any source. AI and plagiarism check (without including references and author names) less than 10% in total.	Mostly original write up with a few sentences copied completely. AI and plagiarism check (without including references and author names) less than 17% in total.	Mostly copied work. AI and/or plagiarism check (without including references and author names and details) greater than 17%. A lot of data taken from a single source. Little to no paraphrasing.
	Format (1 point)	Completely follows the format of the project shared with you including two columns, headings, and text formatting in the report. Figures and tables are exactly made as required in the format document. Is at least 5 pages in length and may exceed the 8 pages length, excluding figures, tables, and references. References are correctly formatted.	Follows most of the guidelines for the format of the project. Font size is not same as required or length of the document is five pages including figures and tables. All required tables and figures are present. Some references may not be correctly formatted.	Follows some/none of the guidelines for the format of the project. Font size is not same as required Length is less than five pages Some required tables and figures are missing. References are not correctly formatted.
	Figure Quality (1 point)	All figures (except where not possible) are high quality (original pdf/svg images). Figures present separately in the submission folder. If generated in powerpoint / adobe / other software, source file also provided in the submission folder.	Some figures (which can be in high quality) are of low quality (generated as pngs or jpegs). Figures present separately in the submission folder. Source files of the good quality images not provided in the submission folder.	Figures are of poor quality in general. Figures are not present separately in the submission folder. Figures are submitted as pngs, jpegs or other similar lossy formats.
	Latest references (1 point)	Contains at least 20 journal/conference references with at least 15 references after 2018. Avoids references to websites and Wikipedia, Medium and similar resources in general. All references are relevant, recent, and from credible sources. The author cites a wide range of sources, including primary research papers, review articles, and authoritative books. All references are traceable / findable using the information provided in the bibliography section.	Contains between 15-20 journal/conference references. More than 30% references are outdated (earlier than 2018) More than 20% references are from websites / Wikipedia / Medium or similar resources. All references are traceable / findable using the information provided in the bibliography section.	Contains fewer than 15 references. Most references are outdated (before 2018). References are irrelevant, outdated, or not from credible sources. References are not properly formatted according to the journal's guidelines. The author cites a limited number of sources, or only a few sources that are not representative of the full range of relevant literature. More than 40% references refer to websites and / or Wikipedia / Medium and similar resources. References are not traceable / not findable using the information provided in the bibliography section.
	Language (2 points)	The language used is clear, concise, and precise. Technical terminology is used appropriately and accurately. Sentences are well-constructed, with a logical flow and appropriate transitions. The report is well-organized, with clear section headings and subheadings. The language is objective and free from bias. The language used is engaging and imaginative, capturing the reader's attention throughout the report. The report is free from grammatical errors and typos.	The language used is generally clear and concise, but there may be some ambiguity or imprecision. Technical terminology is used appropriately, but there may be some inaccuracies or inconsistencies. Sentences are generally well-constructed, but there may be some awkward phrasing or lack of coherence. The report is generally well-organized, but there may be some confusion or lack of clarity in section headings and subheadings. The language used is clear and effective, but not particularly engaging or imaginative. The language is generally objective, but there may be some bias or subjectivity. The report may contain some grammatical errors and typos.	The language used is unclear, imprecise, and difficult to understand. Technical terminology is used incorrectly or inappropriately. Sentences are poorly constructed, with little coherence or logical flow. The report is poorly organized, with confusing or inconsistent section headings and subheadings. The language is highly subjective and biased. The language used is dry and unengaging, making it difficult for the reader to maintain interest. The report contains numerous grammatical errors and typos.
	Literature review and comparison with existing techniques (2 points)	The literature review is comprehensive and includes all the relevant research in the field. The review provides a clear and detailed comparison of the existing techniques, highlighting their strengths and weaknesses. The writer demonstrates a deep understanding of the research and the existing techniques.	The literature review covers most of the relevant research in the field. The review provides some comparison of the existing techniques, but it may be lacking in detail or clarity. The writer demonstrates a good understanding of the research and the existing techniques.	The literature review is incomplete and/or does not cover the relevant research in the field. The review does not provide any comparison of the existing techniques, or the comparison is inaccurate or misleading. The writer demonstrates a poor understanding of the research and the existing techniques.
	Reproducible Methodology (1 point)	The methodology is clearly described and replicable. The authors provide a detailed list of data and methods used. The experiments are well-designed and the data are well-organized. The authors provide all necessary information and scripts to reproduce the results.	The methodology is described in sufficient detail to be replicable. The authors provide a list of data and methods used. The experiments are adequately designed and the data are organized. The authors provide some information and scripts to reproduce the results.	The methodology is poorly described and not replicable. The authors do not provide a list of data and methods used. The experiments are poorly designed and the data are disorganized. The authors do not provide any information or scripts to reproduce the results.
	Presentation of results (2 points)	The results are well-organized, clear, and concise. The data is presented in appropriate formats such as tables, graphs, or charts. The results are supported by appropriate statistical analyses. The results are compared with existing literature and other relevant research.	The results are presented in a clear and organized manner. The data is presented in appropriate formats such as tables, graphs, or charts. The results are supported by some statistical analyses. The results are briefly compared with existing literature and other relevant research.	The results are poorly organized and difficult to understand. The data is not presented in appropriate formats, making it difficult to interpret. The results are not supported by any statistical analyses. The results are not compared with existing literature or other relevant research.
	Detailed and in-depth discussion (2 points)	The discussion provides a thorough analysis of the results, including limitations and implications. The discussion is supported by relevant literature, and the author(s) offer insightful interpretations and explanations. The discussion clearly connects the results to the research question(s) and hypotheses, and addresses any inconsistencies or unexpected findings. The discussion offers suggestions for future research and areas for further investigation.	The discussion provides some analysis of the results, but may lack depth or detail. The discussion is supported by some relevant literature, but may not be fully connected to the results. The discussion offers some interpretations and explanations, but may not fully address all aspects of the results. The discussion offers some suggestions for future research, but may not fully explore all possibilities.	The discussion lacks analysis or interpretation of the results. The discussion is not supported by relevant literature, or the literature is not fully integrated into the discussion. The discussion does not connect the results to the research question(s) or hypotheses, or does not address inconsistencies or unexpected findings. The discussion does not offer suggestions for future research or areas for further investigation.