

## QF2103 Group Project Grading Rubric

### Project report (40 pts)

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Missing
<b>Team roles and responsibilities (3 pts)</b>	Comprehensive table, detailed individual contributions, balanced workload	Clear distribution, minor issues in workload distribution	Outline of responsibilities, limited details	-	No team information provided
<b>Stock selection and strategies (10 pts)</b>	Thorough explanation, clear technical analysis, well-defined strategy with entry/exit rules	Clear explanation, some technical analysis, functional trading strategies with some unclear rules	Basic explanation without strong justification, incomplete trading rules	Minimal explanation, ill-defined strategy	No explanation provided
<b>Trading decisions and documentation (3 pts)</b>	Detailed trading records	Complete trading records	Incomplete trading records	-	Missing trading records
<b>Visualization (10 pts)</b>	Multiple relevant professional-looking graphs, clear labels and legends, graphs provide insightful analysis	Clear graphs with labels and legends, some graphs are less relevant	At least one graph with labels and legends, some basic explanation	Graphs with missing labels or explanation	No visualization

<b>Analysis and future improvements (10 pts)</b>	Comprehensive analysis of returns, thoughtful and actionable improvements	Basic analysis and suggestions for improvements	Simple analysis and vague suggestions for improvements	Incomplete analysis or improvements	No analysis
<b>Writing and organization (4 pts)</b>	Professional presentation, precise and concise writing	Clear organization, minor issues with writing	Major issues with writing, organization or presentation	Poor writing, organization or presentation	-

### Python Code (30 pts)

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
<b>Code quality (15 pts)</b>	Fully executable in a reasonable time, excellent use of data structures and packages	Fully executable but has some efficiency issues, adequate use of data structures and packages	Partially executable, has significant efficiency issues, poor use of data structures and packages	Fail to execute
<b>Documentation and readability (10 pts)</b>	Well-organized and documented repository, clear comments, proper naming of variables and functions	Readable codes and repository, adequate comments, some inappropriate naming of variables and functions	Disorganized codes, limited comments, poor naming of variables and functions	Messy codes, no comments, nonsensical naming of variables and functions
<b>Extensibility (5 pts)</b>	Functional programming, easy to be adapted	Some functional programming, can be extended	Limited functional programming, requires hard work to extend	Hard-coded and cannot be modified

## Presentation (30 pts)

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
<b>Content quality (10 pts)</b>	Well-defined strategies, insightful analysis, comprehensive results	Clear strategies, some technical analysis, clear results	Strategies, analysis, and results are included	Missing strategies, analysis, or results
<b>Presentation quality (10 pts)</b>	Professional-looking visual materials, well-organized presentation	Appropriate use of visual materials, clear organization	Some use of visual materials that may be difficult to read, awkward organization	Missing important visual materials, messy organization
<b>Individual contribution (10 pts)</b>	Confident delivery and voice projection, strong Q&A	Clear delivery, Q&A shows good understanding	Some delivery issues, Weak Q&A	No show or limited presentation time