

Planning Presentation Rubric • UvA AI Second-Year Projects • 2020

Criterion	Professional (+3)	Advanced (+2)	Beginner (+1)	Unacceptable (+0)
Client Contact	The team initiated contact with their client and TA proactively. Serious planning began from the first day of the course, and the presentation incorporates evidence of responding already to client feedback.	The team initiated timely contact with the client and was able to develop a serious plan by the time of the presentation. There was time for the client to provide feedback on the students initial plan.	The team may have waited to hear from their client before contacting them, and did not complete a plan in sufficient time for the client to give feedback before the presentation.	The team communicated insufficiently with their client to be able to make a realistic plan for the rest of the block.
Clarity of Vision	Product vision is clear and insightful, incorporating all relevant contextual factors for the client.	Product vision incorporates most relevant contextual factors for the client. Vision statement is adequately detailed.	Product vision begins to incorporate relevant contextual factors for the client. Vision statement is superficial.	Product vision is vague and incorporates contextual factors for the client only to a limited extent.
Quality of Solution(s)	One or more proposed solutions that indicate a deep comprehension of the problem. Solutions are sensitive to contextual factors as well as all of the following: ethical, logical, and cultural dimensions of the problem.	One or more proposed solutions that indicate comprehension of the problem. Solutions are sensitive to contextual factors as well as the one of the following: ethical, logical, or cultural dimensions of the problem.	One proposed solution that is off-the-shelf rather than individually designed to address the specific contextual factors of the problem.	One proposed solution that is difficult to evaluate because it is vague or only indirectly addresses the problem statement.
Product Backlog	Product backlog items for the upcoming sprint are clearly and realistically chosen, with a specific definition of done. Sprint backlog represents a plainly feasible plan for achieving the sprint goal, with items well estimated in terms of relative time and order.	Product backlog items for the upcoming sprint are clearly chosen, and it is mostly clear when each of these items will be considered done. Sprint backlog represents a plausible plan for achieving the sprint goal, with items estimated in terms of relative time and order.	Upcoming sprint may lack a specific target in terms of product backlog, and there may not be a separate sprint backlog. There is an ordered plan for the sprint, but items may lack time estimates.	There is no separate sprint backlog and only a cursory plan for the upcoming sprint (e.g., to work on the product backlog in priority order). Order of work is unclear, and time estimates are poor or non-existent.
Sprint Backlog	Product backlog is precisely defined in small to mid-size deliverables. Each item in the backlog is well estimated in terms of relative time and priority, in consultation with the product owner.	Product backlog is defined in small to mid-size deliverables, although one or two may be too large or too vague. Each item in the backlog is estimated in terms of relative time and priority.	Product backlog items do not always correspond to small deliverables. Items are prioritised but may lack time estimates.	Product backlog contains just a few items that are mostly too large or too small. Time and priority estimates are poor or non-existent.

Project: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Progress Presentation Rubric • UvA AI Second-Year Projects • 2020

Criterion	Professional (+3)	Advanced (+2)	Beginner (+1)	Unacceptable (+0)
Progress	Deliverable from first sprint implements a solution in a manner that thoroughly and deeply addresses multiple contextual factors of the client's specific problem.	Deliverable from the first sprint implements a solution that addresses multiple contextual factors of the client's specific problem in a surface manner.	Deliverable from the first sprint implements a solution in a manner that addresses the client's problem in principle but ignores relevant contextual factors.	Deliverable from the first sprint is incomplete or does not address the client's problem.
Client Understanding	Presentation demonstrates a thorough understanding of the client's company and industry. Important terminology and business logic from the client's company and industry are used and explained for a broader audience.	Presentation demonstrates a thorough understanding of the client's company. Important terminology and business logic from the client's company are used and explained for a broader audience.	Presentation demonstrates some understanding of the client's company. Terminology and business logic from the client's company is used but not always explained.	Presentation demonstrates little client-specific knowledge, with minimal reference to terminology or business logic that would be relevant for the client.
Presentation	Presentation is very easy to follow. Slides demonstrate great attention to detail and add value. All team members play an active and enthusiastic role. Duration is 10 min. (± 1) and the presentation is in good international English.	Presentation is easy to follow. Slides demonstrate attention to detail and add value. All team members participate actively. Duration is 10 min. (± 2) and the presentation is in understandable English.	Presentation is sometimes difficult to follow. Slides are dull and sometimes of little additional value. All team members participate but with a lack of enthusiasm overall. Duration is too long or too short with some noticeable lapses in English.	Presentation is difficult to follow. Slides are sloppy and mostly of little additional value. Not all team members participate. Duration is far too long or too short, and the presentation is either not in English or the English is too poor to understand.
Product Backlog	Product backlog items for the upcoming sprint are clearly and realistically chosen, with a specific definition of done. Sprint backlog represents a plainly feasible plan for achieving the sprint goal, with items well estimated in terms of relative time and order, possibly with reference to a burn-down chart from the previous sprint.	Product backlog items for the upcoming sprint are clearly chosen, and it is mostly clear when each of these items will be considered done. Sprint backlog represents a plausible plan for achieving the sprint goal, with items estimated in terms of relative time and order.	Upcoming sprint may lack specific targets from product backlog, and it is unclear how the sprint will be considered done. There is an ordered plan for the sprint, but sprint backlog items may lack time estimates.	There is no separate sprint backlog and only a cursory plan for the upcoming sprint (e.g., to work on the product backlog in priority order). Order of works is unclear, and time estimates are poor or non-existent.
Sprint Backlog	Product backlog is precisely defined in small to mid-size deliverables. Each remaining item in the backlog is well estimated in terms of relative time and priority, in consultation with the product owner and with reference to previous sprint velocity and changes in priority.	Product backlog is defined in small to mid-size deliverables, although one or two may be too large or too vague. Each remaining item in the backlog is estimated in terms of relative time and priority, with reference to previous sprint velocity.	Product backlog items do not always correspond to small deliverables. Items are prioritised but may lack time estimates or have time estimates that are unrealistic based on previous sprint velocity.	Product backlog contains just a few items that are mostly too large or too small. Time and priority estimates are poor or non-existent.

Project: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Final Presentation Rubric • UvA AI Second-Year Projects • 2020

Criterion	Professional (+3)	Advanced (+2)	Beginner (+1)	Unacceptable (+0)
Slides	The slides are tidy with no typos, and there is obvious attention to detail, including good figures and appropriate use of colour. The slides add value to the content of the story. They contain enough (but not too much) text, and the bullet points are informative.	The slides are tidy with no typos, and one or two slides demonstrate attention to detail, such as figures or a special use of colour. The slides add value to the content of the story. They may occasionally have too much or too little text, but the bullet points are informative.	The slides are tidy and mostly without typos. The layout is clear and clean, but otherwise unremarkable. Several slides contain too much or too little text or are otherwise difficult to read. Most bullet points are informative.	The slides are somewhat rough. There are many typos and the layout is sometimes sloppy. Most slides have far too much or too little text and several slides are difficult to read. The bullet points are not always informative.
Content	The presentation has a memorable central message that reappears several times during the presentation and is developed clearly. Presenters explain how their final implementation works and which AI techniques they used. Presenters explain in detail how their solution meets their client's needs in a manner that is clearly understandable to fellow students and other clients.	The presentation has a central message that reappears several times during the presentation and is developed clearly. Presenters explain how their final implementation works and which AI techniques they used. Presenters explain how their solution meets their client's needs in a manner that is understandable to fellow students and the clients of other teams.	The presentation has an explicit central message that is somewhat developed. Presenters explain how their final implementation works superficially, with only passing reference to any AI techniques used. Presenters attempt to explain how their solution meets their client's needs in a manner that is mostly understandable to fellow students and the clients of other teams.	It is unclear what the central message of the presentation is. Presenters explain the workings of their final implementation only to a very limited extent, with minimal or no reference to AI techniques used. Presenters poorly explain or do not explain how their solution meets their client's needs, and the level of detail is far too high or far too low for fellow students and the clients of other teams.
Non-verbal Skills	The speakers have an open and enthusiastic demeanour throughout the entire presentation and are oriented toward the audience. Volume, tempo, and intonation are effective for communicating the central message.	The speakers have an open and enthusiastic demeanour throughout most of the presentation and are oriented toward the audience. Volume, tempo, and intonation are not distracting but do not add value per se.	The speakers have an open and enthusiastic demeanour throughout the majority of the presentation and are oriented toward the audience. Volume, tempo, or intonation are occasionally distracting.	The speakers' demeanour is closed or unenthusiastic. Volume, tempo, and intonation are distracting and the presentation is difficult to follow.
Structure/Verbal Skills	The presentation is very easy to follow. Sentences are clear and well formulated without stop-words. There is a logical structure to the story with a clear beginning, middle, and end. Duration is 10 min. (± 1).	The presentation is easy to follow. With a few exceptions, sentences are clear and well formulated. There is a reasonably logical structure to the story with a clear beginning, middle, and end. Duration is 10 min. (± 2).	The presentation is mostly easy to follow. Most sentences are clear and well formulated. There is a structure to the story, although possibly not the most logical one. The beginning, middle, or end may be somewhat unclear. Duration is too long or too short.	The presentation is not always easy to follow. Many sentences are unclear or poorly formulated. There is too little structure to the story. The beginning, middle, and end are unclear. Duration is far too long or too short.

Project: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Final Implementation Rubric • UvA AI Second-Year Projects • 2020

Criterion	Professional (+3)	Advanced (+2)	Beginner (+1)	Unacceptable (+0)
Daily Log	The team logged their progress daily without needing reminders from the TA and made these logs easily available to the TA and the client.	The team logged their progress regularly without needing reminders from the TA, but sometimes only a few days after the fact. The log was always available to the TA and the client.	The team needed reminders from their TA to log their progress. The log may not always have been easy for the TA or client to access.	The team did not log their progress daily or did not share their log with their TA and client in a timely fashion.
Outcome	Final product implements a solution in a manner that thoroughly and deeply addresses multiple contextual factors of the client's problem.	Final product implements a solution that addresses multiple contextual factors of the client's problem in a surface manner.	Final product implements a solution in a manner that addresses the problem in principle but ignores relevant contextual factors.	Final product is incomplete or does not address the client's problem.
Problem Solving	The team not only developed a logical, consistent plan to solve the client's problem using a functional Scrum product backlog, but also recognise consequences of their solution, positive and negative, and can articulate reasons for choosing it.	Having selected from among alternatives, the team developed a logical, consistent plan to solve the client's problem, using a functional Scrum product backlog.	The team considered and rejected less acceptable approaches to solving the client's problem. Product backlog was superficial and not used as a meaningful planning tool.	The team never considered more than one possibility for solving the client's problem. Alternative approaches, if any, came strictly from the client.
Innovative Thinking	The team expanded upon a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product to create something demonstrably new and unusual.	The team developed a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.	The team experimented with creating a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product, but may not have been entirely successful in their attempt.	The team mostly reformulated a collection of available ideas with minimal evidence of divergent, innovative thinking.
Risk Taking	The team actively sought out and followed through on untested and potentially risky directions or approaches to the client's problem.	The team incorporated new directions or approaches to the client's problem.	The team considered new directions or approaches but without actually going beyond the client's basic guidelines.	The team stayed strictly within the client's basic guidelines.
Transfer of Learning	The team independently adapted and applied skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies from the AI programme or other coursework to solve the client's problem in an original way.	The team adapted and applied skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies from the AI programme or other coursework to solve the client's problem.	The team used textbook, 'off-the-shelf' skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies from the AI programme or other coursework to solve the client's problem.	The team used only rudimentary skills, abilities, theories, or methodologies from the AI programme or other coursework while solving the client's problem.
Evaluation of Results	The team have reviewed their results relative to the client's expectations with thorough, specific considerations of need for further work or integration into the client's systems.	The team have reviewed their results relative to the client's expectations with some consideration of need for further work or integration into the client's systems.	The team have reviewed their results relative to the client's expectations with little if any consideration of need for further work or integration into the client's systems.	The team have reviewed their results only superficially with no consideration of need for further work or integration into the client's systems.
Tidiness/Organisation	The implementation is structured coherently and is clearly documented to favour ease of use and possible future extensions. It is sufficiently integrated with the client's needs that it could already be used in production.	The implementation is structured coherently and the documentation is easy to follow. With a small amount of extra work from the client, the implementation could be used in production.	The structure and documentation of the implementation are understandable, but only with some effort. The implementation could be used in production, but only after a moderate amount of work from the client.	The implementation is disorganised and documentation is unclear. It would be difficult to integrate the student's implementation with other products of the client.

Project: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Final Report Rubric • UvA AI Second-Year Projects • 2020

Criterion	Professional (+3)	Advanced (+2)	Beginner (+1)	Unacceptable (+0)
Draft	The team provided an essentially complete draft of the report to the TA and incorporated all feedback into the final draft.	The team provided a mostly complete draft of the report to the TA and incorporated most feedback into the final draft.	The team provided a draft to the TA with one or more sections substantially incomplete, or fails to incorporate TA feedback meaningfully.	The team provided no draft or only a skeletal draft to the TA, with insufficient content to provide meaningful feedback.
Problem Description	The client, problem, and the product vision are described in thorough detail, including a discussion of relevant academic sources, patents, or related commercial products, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the client, the context of the product, and future development opportunities.	The client, problem, and product vision are clearly described and motivated at an appropriate level of detail, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the client and the context of the product.	The client, problem, and product vision are described and motivated at an appropriate level of detail, demonstrating an adequate understanding of the client and the context of the product.	The client, problem, and product vision are described and motivated with too much or too little detail for a general overview. The description demonstrates a basic but superficial understanding of the client and the context of the product.
Implementation Description	The proposed solution and developed product are described in an easily understandable and well-structured manner, explaining the individual components of the product and how they operate in considerable detail. The description conveys a deep understanding of the product's strengths and weaknesses.	The proposed solution and developed product are described in a mostly understandable and well-structured manner, explaining the individual components of the product and how they operate in detail. The description conveys a pragmatic understanding of the product's strengths and weaknesses.	The proposed solution and developed product are described in a somewhat understandable, with occasional lapses in organisation. Individual components of the product are referenced are mostly described in detail, with one or two exceptions. The description conveys a basic understanding of the product's strengths, and possibly also weaknesses.	The description of the proposed solution and developed product is too disorganised or too short to be understood without effort. Individual components are merely listed, mostly without detailed explanation. It is unclear how well the authors understand the strengths and weaknesses of their product.
Structure	The report has a clean table of contents and title page, where all necessary project details are given. The report follows the Canvas template or an alternative template preferred by the client with customised headings and sub-headings that help the reader navigate the report easily. The length is 3500–5000 words, excluding the product documentation. Product documentation is thorough, clearly organised (e.g., with its own table of contents), and easy for newcomers to follow.	The report has a table of contents and title page, where all necessary project details are given. The report follows the Canvas template or an alternative template preferred by the client with standard headings and sub-headings. The length is 2000–3500 words, excluding the product documentation. Product documentation is complete but possibly difficult for a newcomer to follow.	The report mostly follows the Canvas template or an alternative template preferred by the client, including a title page and table of contents, but the structure feels forced or awkward. The length may be too long or too short, and product documentation is incomplete.	The report may lack a table of contents or title page. The report partially follows the Canvas template or an alternative template preferred by the client, and headings/sub-headings are insufficient to navigate the report easily. The report may be too long or too short, and product documentation may be missing.
Style and Layout	The report is written in formal, precise, and concise academic English with few errors. The report has a professional layout with carefully selected and designed tables and figures.	The report is written in formal, precise, and concise academic English with minor errors. The report has a clean layout with appropriately chosen and readable tables and figures.	The report is written in English, but the tone is overly informal or vague. The layout is dull, and tables and figures are difficult to read and add little value.	The report is written in English, with a sufficient number of errors in grammar or tone to hinder understanding. The layout is sloppy, and tables and figures are absent or unreadable.

Project: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Professionalism Rubric • UvA AI Second-Year Projects • 2020

Criterion	Highly Professional (+3)	Professional (+2)	Less Professional (+1)	Unprofessional (+0)
Communication	The team communicates with the client regularly, clearly, and concisely. The team proactively keeps their client and TA informed about their progress and planning of the project. Most crucial decisions are foreseen and discussed in advance, and all crucial decisions are resolved with the client's input.	The team communicates with the client regularly and clearly. The team keeps their client and TA informed about their progress and planning of the project. When crucial decisions need to be made, the team ensures that the client is in agreement before presenting a deliverable.	The team communicates with the client as needed. The team gives the client and TA progress updates when requested. Some crucial decisions may be taken before fully consulting the client, leading to unpleasant surprises when presenting deliverables.	The team rarely communicates with the client and provides only irregular indications of progress to the client and the TA. Crucial decisions may be taken without consulting the client.
Teamwork	Members helps the team move forward in meetings by articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals. Team members constructively build upon or synthesise the contributions of others as well as notice when someone is not participating, inviting them to engage. The team addresses destructive conflict directly and constructively, helping to manage/resolve it in a way that strengthens overall team cohesiveness and future effectiveness.	During meetings, team members offer alternative solutions or courses of action that build on the ideas of others. Team members constructively build upon or synthesise the contributions of others. The team identifies and acknowledges conflict and stays engaged with it.	During meetings, team members offer new suggestions to advance the work of the group. When necessary, team members can restate the views of other team members and/or ask questions for clarification. In case of conflict, the team redirects focus toward common ground and toward task at hand (away from conflict).	Members share ideas during meetings but do not advance the work of the team. Team members listen to each other without interrupting or attacking, but may not understand or be able to repeat what has been said. When conflict arises, the team passively accepts alternate viewpoints without resolving the source of the conflict.
Organisation	Team members arrive early for meetings so that everything is ready at the starting time. The team is thoroughly prepared when meeting clients and sends agendas with concise supplementary material in advance. The team meets project deadlines well in advance and fulfils all other agreements.	Team members come to meetings on time. The team is well-prepared when meeting clients and has an agenda prepared. The team meets project deadlines and other agreements comfortably.	Team members may arrive five to ten minutes late to meetings. The team is mostly prepared when attending meetings but may not have thought about an agenda in advance. The team meets project deadlines and other agreements, but possibly at the last minute.	Team members are late or miss meetings altogether. The team is not always prepared to answer client questions when meeting and has no agenda. The team misses some deadlines or struggles to meet other agreements.

Project: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____