Project

Category	Full Marks (3 Points)	Partial Credit (2 Points)	Partial Credit (1 Points)	No Marks (0 Points)	Score
Quality of Work	Work (e.g., code) looks correct and organized. The project's readme file is clear, intelligible, and give a good idea of what the project is about.	Work (e.g., code) looks mostly correct and organized. The code could be better structured. OR the project readme file is somewhat unclear.	Work (e.g., code) is mostly disorganized. OR the project readme file is very unclear.	No code is given.	
Comments (e.g. Give an example of what could be improved. How can the code or readme file be improved?, etc.)		Readme file only stated the title of the project and included a link to the outline of the video. More information about the project could have been provided in the readme – indicating that the outline was discussed in the video			
Intellectual Merit	The project looks interesting, creative, and/or substantial.	The project is interesting, creative, and/or substantial, but does not seem feasible to do in a semester.	The project lacks substantial complexity.	No code is given or the project description is too vague to determine if the research has merit.	
Comments (e.g. Give an example of what could be improved. If the project is too complex, what parts of the project could feasibly done? If the project is too simple, what features could be added?)	Project is very interesting and seems feasible. Progress has already been made ie. Data has been collected and some analysis has began				

Video	The video gives a helpful, clear depiction of the project.	The video gives a helpful, clear depiction of the project, but is confusing or vague in parts.	The video does not give a helpful, clear depiction of the project.	The video is missing or is inappropriate.	
Comments (e.g. Give constructive feed back to help improve the presentation style.)	Video gave detailed information about the project and even went over his first few steps in his project ie. Collection of data and beginning of analysis				