

# 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 was very detailed; it went over the basics of the project and gave extra info on what specific parts of the project will be responsible for				
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 seems interesting, but a lot needs to be implemented and so far there is no code for that. He's still learning React, and he will be working with his brother on this so maybe it may be complete by the end of the semester.			

<b>Video</b>	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.	
<b>Comments (e.g. Give constructive feed back to help improve the presentation style.)</b>	Video was detailed, and he was able to go over some aspects of his project				