

Criterion	Exemplary (Directly relevant)	Accomplished (Somewhat relevant)	Developing (Remotely related)	Beginning (Totally unrelated)	Marks
<b>Introduction/ background study</b>	Clear background study about the topic.  (3)	Good background study about the topic.  (2)	Limited interpretation on background study about the topic.  (1)	Background study of the topic is misleading/ missing.  (0)	___ /3
<b>Methodology, results and discussion</b>	The project details are discussed in a detailed manner.  The results are well discussed.  (8-9)	The project details are discussed adequately.  The results are discussed adequately.  (6-7)	The project details are poorly written, but still able to relate to the project.  The results are poorly discussed.  (3-5)	The methodology is missing, or the content doesn't reflect the methodology of the project.  The results are not discussed/the discussions are misleading.  (0-2)	___ /9
<b>Conclusion/ future work/ references/ structure/ language</b>	The content is well written.  The report is well formatted, with minimum grammatical mistakes.  (3)	The content is understandable.  The report is well formatted, with minimum grammatical mistakes.  (2)	The content is poorly written.  The report is poorly formatted/There are a number of grammatical mistakes.  (1)	The content is missing/misleading.  The report is unreadable in terms of structure and language.  (0)	___ /3
<b>Presentation</b>	The presentation is complete and interesting without errors.  The presenters are able to answer questions without errors.  (5)	The presentation is complete and interesting with minor errors.  The presenters are able to answer questions with some minor errors.  (3-4)	The presentation is partially complete.  The presenters are able to answer selected questions.  (1-2)	The presenters are missing, or the presentation is not complete.  The presenters not able to answer any questions.  (0)	___ /5
<b>Total</b>					___ /20