Big Data Management (BDMA & MIRI Masters) Project Evaluation Rubric

Alberto Abelló, Sergi Nadal and Oscar Romero

1 Technical Realizability (35%)

	4	3	2	1
Quality of Information	Information clearly relates to the main topic. It includes several supporting details and/or examples.	Information mainly relates to the main topic. It provides some supporting details and/or examples.	Information somehow relates to the main topic. No details and/or examples are given.	Information has little or nothing to do with the main topic.
Sources	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented in the desired format.	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but a few are not in the desired format.	All sources (information and graphics) are accurately documented, but many are not in the desired format.	Some sources are not accurately documented.
Scientific Concepts	Explanation shows complete understanding of the scientific concepts used to solve the problem(s).	Explanation shows substantial understanding of the scientific concepts used to solve the problem(s).	Explanation shows some understanding of the scientific concepts needed to solve the problem(s).	Explanation shows very limited understanding of the underlying concepts needed to solve the problem(s) OR is not written.
Calculations	All calculations are shown and the results are correct and labeled appropriately.	Some calculations are shown and the results are correct and labeled appropriately	Some calculations are shown and the results labeled appropriately.	No calculations are shown OR results are inaccurate or mislabeled.
Conclusion	Conclusion includes whether the findings supported the hypothesis, possible sources of error, and what was learned from the research.	Conclusion includes whether the findings supported the hypothesis and what was learned from the research.	Conclusion includes what was learned from the research.	No conclusion was included in the report OR shows little effort and reflection.
Overall Feasibility	Leaves listener with overall impression that plan is feasible.	Leaves listener with overall impression that plan is likely feasible.	Leaves listener with overall impression that plan is somewhat feasible.	Leaves listenerer with overall impression that plan was not very feasible.

2   Functionality (20%)

	4	3	2	1
Satisfaction	Exceeds requirements	Meets requirements	Insufficient fit to requirements	Poor fit to requirements
Reusability	In different domains	In different context, same domain	In same context	No reuse
Ease of use	Very easy	Easy	Difficult	Very difficult
Practical	Solution is really practical	Solution looks practical	Doubts appear about practicality	Solution is not really practical

3   Construction (25%)

	4	3	2	1
Structuring	The architecture of the artifact presents clear interfaces, high cohesion, low coupling and gives a view of a unique system.	The architecture of the artifact presents 3 of the four characteristics.	The architecture of the artifact presents 2 of the four characteristics.	The architecture of the artifact presents at most one of the four characteristics.
Inventivity	Surprise for supervisors.	Surprise for professionals.	Surprise for laymen.	No surprise.
Diagrams and Sketches	Diagrams and/or sketches of proposed artifact are clear and greatly add to the reader's understanding.	Diagrams and/or sketches of proposed artifact are clear and easy to understand.	Diagrams and/or sketches of proposed artifact are somewhat difficult to understand.	Diagrams and/or sketches of proposed artifact are difficult to understand or are not included in the presentation.
Convincingness of the artifact built	Formal and empirical proof	Empirical proof based on prototype	Empirical proof based on simulation	Informal proof or no proof at all

4 Presentation (20%)

	4	3	2	1
Completeness	All needed knowledge about the project was provided.	Almost all needed knowledge was provided.	Some relevant elements of the project were not presented.	Many relevant elements of the project were not presented
Correctness	All the statements of the presentation were correct.	Some statements were not completely accurate.	Some statements were clearly wrong	The presentation had plenty of mistakes
Structure	The presentation is well structured into introduction body and conclusions, inside the time limit	One of the three elements is not appropriate or time limit is exceeded in more than 10%	More than one of the three elements is not appropriate or the time limit was exceeded in more than 20%	There was not clear structure in the presentation and no time control
Summarization	Main ideas are presented, together with causes, consequences and solutions provided	Some relevant ideas are missing or causes and consequences are not completely clear	Some cornerstone ideas are missing or relationship between causes and consequences is messed up	Many important ideas are missing, and causes and consequences are not provided
Answer to questions	Presenter is prepared to answer, demonstrates full knowledge and the answer is thorough	Presenter was mostly prepared, demonstrated knowledge and the answer was mostly thorough	Presenter was not completely prepared, knowledge was not clear and the answer was out of scope	Presenter was not listening, didn't have a grasp of information and did not really answer
Speaking style	Student is completely prepared and expressions generate a strong interest	Students seems pretty prepared and sometimes shows a strong interest and enthusiasm	Student is somewhat prepared and tries to show enthusiasm	Student does not seem prepared and does not transmit much interest
Support	The slides were well organized are really helped to transmit the messages	Slides order was mostly logical and contain essential knowledge about the topic	There was redundancy and some factual errors in the slides	Content is minimal and highly disordered
Understandability and pace	The presentation is in sequence with creative connections between events and the speech is sustained throughout with few pauses or stumbling	The presentation is in sequence, and the speech is sustained most of the time	The presentation presents some omissions, but maintains the sequence and the speech is choppy	The presentation seems very disconnected and the speech uneven