

| COS 801 HW1 Rubric | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--|--|---|---|
| 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. |
| Introduction (5) | Very Poor or Nothing | Not connected to the rest of the document. Does not motivate the work and why it matters. Does not guide for the rest of the document. | Motivates for the work somewhat. Gives a little background. An attempt at a guide for the rest of the document. | Motivates for the work. Includes some background. Explains work. Guide to rest of document. | Motivates for the work. Guide to rest of document. Variety of references. |
| 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 (10) | Very Poor or Nothing | Experiments are not adequate. Experiments not connected to methodology or problem statement. Non-existent 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 referencing. 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. |
| 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 |