CS F 429 Natural Language Processing

Project evaluation and rubrics for assessments

Project Group Size: Max of 4 persons.

Problem definition for the project: You are free to pick up any problem in the area of NLP as long as you are able to get the data sets for training and testing your models.

A few data sets are provided for your reference in the following link

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1P-KnNpJcYe8KD_Z31cnrtvWJZJjZTsFHi6e1eoLQ1ho/edit?usp=sharing

Part -1 (10% Before MidSem grading) OCT 22nd and 23rd

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Poor (1-0)
Problem Definition	The goals or objectives of the project are clearly stated and described.	The goals or objectives of the project are described well but could benefit from minor fine-tuning.	The goals or objectives of the project are comprehensible but need further refinement.	The goals or objectives of the project are insinuated but not explicitly stated.
Literature Survey Purpose and need of the project	Outstanding investigation in all aspects. Detailed and extensive explanation of the purpose and need of the project	Well-researched project, good depth and thoroughness, sensible planning of research and well referenced throughout. Collects a great deal of information and good study of the existing systems	Research is clear and structured. Appropriate coverage is present and referenced. Moderate study of the existing systems; collects some basic information	Minimal research or cursory coverage , minimal referencing, Moderate explanation of the purpose and need of the project

Project Scheduling & Distribution of Work among Team members	Detailed and extensive Scheduling with timelines provided for each phase of the project. Work breakdown structure well defined.	Good Scheduling of projects. Work breakdown structure properly defined.	Moderate scheduling of projects. Work breakdown insufficient	Poor / No Project scheduling done. No Work breakdown structure provided.
Text preprocessing	Clearly articulate the need of preprocessing along with proper justification	Clearly articulate the need of preprocessing and unable to explain how they impact the project	State the preprocessing techniques applied and cannot substantiate why they are used.	No preprocessing applied

Part -2 (15%) Dates for the demo will be announced

Methodology and Experiments – 5%

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Poor (1-0)
Methodology	Provides accurate, thorough description of how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, Methodology/algorithm	Provides mostly accurate and thorough description regarding the data and the data sources. However, the methodology is not clear enough and needs fine-tuning.	Provides basic information about the data collected, the data sources and the methodology/algorithms used. Methodology is unclear and needs improvement.	No description has been provided. Methodology is not relevant/inadequate or poorly described.

	The execution runs accurately. The expected results and the output match. The goals of the project are met.	Execution runs accurately.Some of the expected results and the output match. Some goals have not been reached.	Execution runs partially. A few goals have been reached. Some of the results and expected output match.	None of the goals have been reached. Inaccurate results.
Experiments				

Research Paper-5%

	(5)	**(3)**	**(2)**	**(1)**
Thesis	clearly stated and appropriately focused; Student created research questions clearly discussed	clearly stated but focus could have been sharper; Student created research questions discussed	thesis phrasing too simple, lacks complexity; or, not clearly worded; Student created research questions not clearly discussed	thesis lacks a clear objective and/or does not "fit" content of essay: Student created research questions not discussed
Supporting Research	thorough and relevant	less thorough but still substantial and relevant	adequate; relevance made clear	insufficient; relevance not always made clear
Focus & Content	sharp, distinct focus; balanced, substantial, specific, and/or illustrative content; mature ideas are particularly well-developed	Clear focus; specific, illustrative, and balanced content	adequate focus, but unbalanced content; more analysis needed	essay contains too much research information without analysis or commentary
Organization	obviously controlled and/or subtle organization strong topic sentences	logical and appropriate organization; clear topic sentences	organization attempted, but unclear or inappropriate topic sentences	inconsistent organization

Mechanics & Usage	free of mechanical and usage errors	few mechanical and usage errors	some mechanical and usage errors, but not severe enough to interfere significantly with writer's purpose	mechanical and usage errors which interfere with writer's purpose
Works Cited Page	6-8 sources sources are accurately documented in a proper format	5-6 all sources are documented in a proper format	3-5 sources are documented	Less than 3 sources are documented; lack proper documentation

Final Presentation-5%

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Good (3)	Average (2)	Poor (1-0)
Overall organization of presentation	- Well-structured and presented in a logical sequence, used time wisely - The group collectively covered all the major topics/issues.	- Mostly structured, precise but parts may be unconnected to the rest of the presentation - The group collectively covered most of the topics/issues.	- Somewhat structured but too much time spent on unimportant material. Disjointed sequence - A few of the individuals covered many of the topics/issues	- Unstructured, strays from the subject. Much of the presentation is out of logical order. Goes over time limit - The group presented the topics in such a manner that the audience could not follow/understand
Response to questions and comments	- The group collectively demonstrates full knowledge by answering all questions with explanation and elaboration	- The group is at ease with expected answers to all questions, but fails to elaborate.	- The group is able to answer only rudimentary questions	- The group cannot answer questions about subject
Individual – comprehensibility, eye contact and elocution	- Clear and easily understood - Maintains eye contact with audience, seldom	- Mostly clear but some confusion in the presentation - Maintains eye contact most of the time, but frequently returns to notes	- Somewhat clear but leaves the listener a little lost. - Occasionally uses eye contact, but still reads most of report	- Unclear and confusing. Not understood. - Reads all of report with no eye contact - Mumbles and speaks too quietly for students in the back of class to hear

| | returns to notes

- Uses a clear voice and modulation so that all audience can hear presentation | - Voice is clear; most audience can hear presentation | - Voice is low; audience have difficulty hearing presentation | |

In case you have any queries please reach out to the TA Mr.Pranav Balaji via email

f20190040@hyderabad.bits-pilani.ac.in