

COS 802 Rubric for Projects					
Criteria	Very Poor (0.0)	Poor (2.5)	Adequate (5.0)	Good (7.5)	Excellent(10.0)
Problem Statement (5)	Very Poor or Nothing	Does not cover research questions and sub-questions.	Covers research questions and sub-questions. Connected to the topic.	Covers research questions and sub-questions. Connected well to the topic.	Covers research questions and sub-questions. Shows deep understanding of the topic.
Literature Survey (10)	Very Poor or Nothing	Covers some background. No logical structure. No merit or gaps in other work highlighted. Work referred to is not related to research topics or questions.	Covers some background. Discusses some merit and/or gaps in other work.	Good coverage of background. Discusses merits and gaps in other work. Identifies which gap is filled by work. Few errors.	Good coverage of background. Discusses merits and gaps in other work. Identifies which gap is filled by work. No error.
Approach/Methodology/Data (10)	Very Poor or Nothing	Methodology is not suitable to answer the research questions. Answers of the methodology cannot answer the research questions or connect to problem statement.	Methodology is adequately suitable. Answers in methodology may lead to answers for some research questions.	Methodology is suitable. Answers of the methodology will lead to answers for most of the research questions.	Methodology is excellent. Answers of the methodology will lead to answers for ALL the research questions.
Experiments & Results (15)	Very Poor or Nothing	Experiments are not adequate. Experiments not connected to methodology or problem statement. Non existant discussion.	Adequate experiments and result discussion.	Good experiments and results discussion. Experiments tie well to approach and problem statement.	Excellent experiments and results presented.
Conclusion & Discussion (10)	Very Poor or Nothing	Does not close the loop between what the project was about and how the research has reached its answers.	Wraps up research report. Covers major points.	Wraps up research report. Covers major findings, gaps and proposes future work.	Excellent conclusion, discussion and plan for future work.
Writing & References (10)	Very Poor or Nothing	Writing is poor and does not communicate ideas. Referencing is inadequate. Missing sections. Poor use of template.	Writing communicates work but could be improved. Referencing is consistent and well used. Has abstract, introduction, methodology, experiments and conclusion.	Good writing and proper referenciong. Writing enhances the understanding of the work. Few errors. Has abstract, introduction, methodology, experiments and conclusion.	Excellent writing and referencing throughout. Writing of the standard of a good scientific paper. Minor if any errors. Has abstract, introduction, methodology, experiments and conclusion.
Presentation (15)	Very Poor or Nothing	Not well prepared. Presenter did not address work adequately or clearly. Presenter had a hard time dealing with questions.	Presenteation delivers key message. Presenter was prepared. Presenter did clearly articulate their workl.	Good communication. Presenteation delivers key message. Within time. Presenter was prepared. Presenter did clearly articulate their work and was able to discuss aspects of their work.	Excellent communication. Presentation balances delivering the key message from work. Covering motivation, approach, results and insights. Presenter clearly presented their work and discussed finer points and limitations of their work.
Project Repo (10)	Very Poor or Nothing	Files/Notebooks available. No README. Hard to be able to run experiments.	Files/Notebooks available. README available. Experiments can be run but subset.	Good project repo. README, how to.	Excellent project repo. Documentation and proper folder management with package lists, README