ASSSESSMENT SCHEME FOR GROUP PROJECTS
Prof. M Loecher

WS/SS	Project/Team

PRESENTATION (25%)								
		excellent	**++**	**+**	**0**	**–**	**– –**	**amendable**
CONTENT (70%)	Structure (10%)	Applies the defined structure; easy to follow; the common thread is evident; logically consistent						Cluttered; complicated; confusing; inconsistent
	Priorities (10%)	Good balance of „main points“ (slides 5/6) and „minor points“; right focus; customer-oriented (highly responsive to Prof's & students' questions)						Main points remain too short; minor matters too long (got bogged down in details); inflexible regarding customer's requests/ demands
	Findings (50%)	Presentation demonstrates a deep understanding of MODELING OF DATA. Great value for the class; we learn from this presentation; profound explanation; comments are rewarding and reasonable.						Presentation demonstrates only a basic understanding of data models: Very basic analysis with shallow explanation; few or no details / examples; suggested improvements remain superficial and / or unfeasible (not well thought through)
Creativity (10%)		Fresh ways for emphasizing important aspects; productive ideas for demonstrating ideas/ thoughts (highly supportive / helpful for understanding)						Fanciless; boring; not raising any attention; not supportive
PRESENCE (12%)	Language	Confident/ skilled use of language; sensitive use of professional expressions; sophisticated vocabulary						Cumbersome; unconfident; limited set of vocabulary; too simple grammar/ sentences; use of unprofessional jargon
	Speech	Lively; fluent; adequate (in volume and intonation); includes supportive breaks; raises attention; free						Monotonous or overstated; hard to listen (regarding volume and/ or intonation); hesitant; based on notes
	Body Language	Open and friendly; addressing the audience (eye contact / gestures)						Dismissive; unwelcoming; not addressing the audience
Orchestration (5%)		All team members are involved; harmonious flow of passages; all members are attentive – even if they do not have an “active” part; team members help each other						Team is a collection of „lone fighters“; people are self-concentrated; no awareness for team needs and team result
Use of Media (3%)		Skilled use of media (the right type in the right moment); media is understood as a supportive instrument; well-prepared technics (plan B in case of technical problems)						Clumsy use of media (the wrong type; too much, not in the right moment, etc.); media is treated as a silver bullet; technical problems limit the quality of the presentation (not well set up; no plan B)

ASSSESSMENT SCHEME FOR GROUP PROJECTS
Prof. M Loecher

WS/SS	Project/Team

NOTEBOOK/REPORT (75%)								
		excellent	**++**	**+**	**0**	**–**	**– –**	**amendable**
CODING (30%)	Reproducability (10%)	Paths to data are correct, libraries loading, easy to execute chunk by chunk						Complicated error messages, impossible to reproduce
	Sophistication, Creativity (10%)	Good modularity, easy to debug, intelligently chosen data structures, appropriate libraries used, "the right hammer for the nail"						Basic coding, no attempt to improve structure or modularity.
	Efficiency (10%)	Lookup tables, if needed, efficient libraries, vectorized computations, avoiding repeat computations, memory efficiency, parallelization…						Wasteful in memory and CPU usage, no attempt at lean computations

Writeup (15%)		Thorough explanation of concepts, motivation, flow. Enough comments to understand the code well. References to papers, figures, tables. Figures are legible, communicate a clear message, have captions and/or legends and have appropriate font sizes. **If you use or build upon an existing kaggle kernel, please provide the reference!**						No flow, lots of open questions, unexplained acronyms/terms, low quality figures, no references,
Modeling (45%)	Versatility and Complexity of Methods	Several modeling strategies were attempted, fine tuning and improvements are clear						One simple model, no refinements
	Appropriateness of Method	appropriate models used, "the right hammer for the nail"						Models are indiscriminately "thrown at" the problem
	Creativity, Feature Engineering	Design of new features, creative problem solving, improvement of models or data, "out of the box thinking"						Copying of existing concepts/code, no taking it to the next level, quick surrender at challenges..
Scientific Soundness (5%)		defensible results, no logical oversights						Obvious logical flaws or contradictions
Data Insights (5%)		Value gained from analysis w.r.t. to understanding data						Data are as "black box" as at the onset