

IT3041 – IRWA Group Assignment

Marking Rubric

Mid Evaluation – 20 Marks

Criteria	Excellent (Full Marks)	Good	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
System Architecture (5)	Clear, detailed diagram; logical components; scalability & Responsible AI considered.	Clear architecture, minor gaps in logic/scalability.	Basic diagram; lacks clarity in structure or scalability.	Incomplete or unclear system structure.
Agent Roles & Communication Flow (5)	Roles well-defined; smooth communication protocols (e.g., MCP, APIs) clearly explained.	Roles defined but some unclear responsibilities; protocols partly justified.	Roles somewhat vague; communication unclear or weakly justified.	No clear roles or communication flow.
Progress Demo (4)	Working prototype/demo; strong evidence of progress; features aligned with objectives.	Prototype partially working; reasonable progress.	Limited functionality; weak progress demonstration.	No meaningful demo or evidence of progress.
Responsible AI Check (3)	Explicitly shows fairness, transparency, and ethical	Mentions Responsible AI but lacks depth.	Minimal mention of ethical practices.	No evidence of Responsible AI considerations.

	handling of data.			
Commercialization Pitch (3)	Clear, feasible business idea; pricing model & target users identified.	Some commercial thinking but lacks details.	Very basic commercialization idea.	No commercialization pitch.

Gen AI-Based Video (25 Marks)

Criteria	Excellent (Full Marks)	Good	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
Clarity & Explanation (8)	Clear, logical explanation of system; engaging and beginner-friendly.	Mostly clear; minor gaps in clarity or flow.	Understandable but confusing in places.	Unclear or poorly explained.
Demonstration of System (7)	Strong demo with meaningful results; shows full workflow.	Demo shown but some features missing.	Limited demo with partial results.	No clear demo included.
Use of Gen AI Tools (5)	Creative, professional use of tools (Synthesia, Pika, HeyGen, etc.).	Tools used effectively but not creatively.	Basic use of tools, minimal effort.	No/poor use of Gen AI tools.
Technical Accuracy (3)	All explanations technically correct and	Mostly correct, minor inaccuracies.	Some inaccuracies in technical details.	Many errors or misconceptions.

	aligned with system.			
Presentation Quality (2)	Excellent visuals/audio; professional editing.	Good quality with minor issues.	Acceptable but low-quality production.	Poor quality; distracting issues.

Final Report + GitHub Repository (35 Marks)

(A) Final Report – 30 Marks

Criteria	Excellent (Full Marks)	Good	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
System Design & Methodology (8)	Detailed architecture, methods, and clear justification of choices.	Mostly clear with minor gaps.	Basic system description; weak justification.	Unclear or missing design details.
Responsible AI Practices (6)	Explicit integration of fairness, explainability, transparency, and privacy.	Responsible AI mentioned but partly integrated.	Limited references to ethical practices.	No mention of Responsible AI.
Commercialization Plan (6)	Clear pricing model, target users, market strategy; practical and innovative.	Plan present but lacks depth in strategy/pricing.	Basic pricing idea; limited business thinking.	No commercialization plan.

Evaluation Results (5)	&	Thorough evaluation, metrics, and meaningful insights.	Good evaluation but limited depth.	Basic evaluation with minimal results.	No evaluation or results.
Structure & Writing Quality (5)		Well-structured 20+ page report, coherent, error-free, original.	Clear writing; minor issues in flow or style.	Adequate but weak writing style.	Poorly structured or plagiarized.

(B) GitHub Repository – 5 Marks

Criteria	Excellent (Full Marks)	Good	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Marks
Code Quality & Organization (3)	Clean, modular, well-documented codebase.	Mostly clean; some comments missing.	Basic functionality; limited documentation.	Messy code; no documentation.	/3
README & Documentation (2)	Clear setup, usage guide, contributors, and repo structure.	Mostly clear but missing some details.	Basic README present.	No README or unusable.	/2

Viva – 20 Marks

Criteria	Excellent (Full Marks)	Good	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
Technical Depth (5)	Strong technical mastery; answers with confidence .	Good technical knowledge; some gaps.	Basic technical responses.	Weak or incorrect responses.
Individual Contribution (5)	All members contribute equally and confidently .	Most contribute, minor imbalance.	Only some contribute actively.	Very uneven participation.
Understanding of Communication Protocols (4)	Excellent grasp of MCP, APIs, or other protocols used.	Good understanding , minor errors.	Limited understanding .	No understanding shown.
Responsible AI Explanation (3)	Strong explanation of ethical practices and integration.	Some explanation, but shallow.	Minimal explanation.	No mention of Responsible AI.
Commercialization & Pricing (3)	Clear, realistic business model	Basic pricing idea discussed.	Weak business justification.	No commercialization explanation.

	explained well.			
--	--------------------	--	--	--