

## Rubric - CI Term Project Report

Student name: \_\_\_\_\_

Project title: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Year \_\_\_\_\_

Performance indicator	Exemplary (10-9)	Satisfactory (8-7)	Min. acceptable (6-5)	Unacceptable (4-0)
<b>Title, abstract and cover page</b>	Cover page, title and abstract are <b>succinct, informative</b> and offer sufficiently specific details about the problem, proposed methods and generated data	Cover page, title and abstract are <b>relevant</b> , offering details about the proposed research study	Cover page, title and abstract <b>need improvement</b> ; not very informative	Cover page, title or <b>abstract missing</b> or <b>inappropriate</b> to the given problem, methods used and data generated
<b>Introduction section, significance and purpose of the study</b>	<b>Excellent introduction.</b> Articulates reasonable, clear research questions given the purpose. The statements are <b>clearly supported</b> from the findings and state-of-the-art-literature	Has a good introduction; the <b>research</b> questions are <b>well stated</b> ; and the findings are well introduced	<b>Little description</b> of the problem; the findings are only <b>partial</b> and/or <b>not well</b> introduced	Introduction to the problem, research questions and/or findings are <b>omitted or inappropriate</b>
<b>Literature review</b>	The literature review is <b>comprehensive</b> from the peer-reviewed research literature. The problem is <b>appropriately grounded</b> to literature. Project questions are <b>connected to the relevant, reliable</b> literature	The literature review is <b>appropriate</b> but needs to show advantages and limitations of other works	Review of the literature is <b>covered only partially</b> . It has <b>old</b> and/or <b>unreliable</b> references	The review of the literature is <b>missing</b> or <b>inappropriate</b> or consisted of <b>non-research-based</b> articles
<b>Obtained results</b>	Obtains <b>meaningful</b> results with <b>minimal</b> wasted <b>effort</b>	Produces <b>some</b> results but not enough (or too many)	Obtains <b>few</b> <b>meaningful</b> results but can improve	<b>Generates no</b> <b>meaningful</b> results
	Provides thorough <b>logical and correct</b> <b>analysis</b> of the data and discusses <b>critically</b> the findings	Provides <b>analysis</b> quite <b>sufficiently</b> thorough	Provides analysis but only <b>partially correct</b>	Little meaningful analysis or <b>deliberately incorrect</b> ; findings <b>not</b> explained
<b>Formulated conclusions</b>	Formulates and <b>adequately supports</b> <b>meaningful</b> conclusions	<b>Needs some help</b> in formulating meaningful conclusions	Conclusions are <b>partially</b> <b>meaningful</b> and <b>incomplete</b>	Conclusions are <b>absent, wrong, trivial</b> or <b>unproven</b>

<b>Methods</b>	The used <b>methods and assumptions are justified</b> and discussed as well their <b>validity</b> , advantages and limitations. The <b>errors</b> in using these methods are <b>reported and discussed</b>	Used <b>methods are justified</b> but their <b>validity</b> , advantages and limitations are <b>partially reported</b>	Used <b>methods</b> and their <b>validity</b> , advantages and limitations are <b>not appropriately justified</b>	Used <b>methods</b> and their <b>validity</b> , advantages and limitations are <b>omitted or inappropriate</b>
<b>Interpretation and discussions</b>	Provides <b>logical, critical and correct analysis</b> of the data and discusses the findings. <b>Clearly explains</b> how the study supports or disagrees with previous studies and why	Provides <b>logical and correct analysis</b> of the data and discusses the findings, but do not <b>explains</b> how these support or disagree with previous studies	<b>Data analysis</b> is not well covered, <b>does not explains</b> how the results support or disagree with previous studies	No/or <b>inappropriate</b> discussions of the findings. <b>No comparison</b> with previous studies
<b>Recommendations for future work</b>	Makes <b>insightful recommendations</b> and <b>succinctly addresses perspectives</b> for further research	Makes some <b>good recommendations</b> and perspectives for further research	Makes <b>broad or obvious</b> suggestions for future work	Makes <b>no plausible</b> suggestions for future work
<b>English composition and citations</b>	Consistently <b>well written; spelling, citations, references</b> , headings, table of contents, page numbers and document sections	Manuscript <b>conforms to most standards</b> of English composition	Manuscript contains <b>many mistakes and bad use of tenses</b> . Citations are <b>not appropriate</b>	Manuscript contains too <b>many mistakes</b> <b>Fails</b> to apply citations, references <b>not appropriate</b>
<b>References</b>	The references are <b>appropriate</b> for the statements; they are <b>up-to-date</b> . They are properly <b>cited following</b> the guidelines	The references are <b>appropriate</b> but are <b>not up-to-date and/or</b> are <b>not cited following</b> the guidelines	References are <b>not supporting</b> the study; cited in an ad-hoc way (e.g. [1–10], not <b>properly following</b> the guidelines	Most of the references are <b>not related</b> to the problem, <b>not up-to-date</b> and/or not <b>cited following</b> the guidelines