

	Does not meet (0-1)	Nearly meets (2)	Meets (3-4)	Exceeds (5)
<b>Data Preprocessing &amp; Augmentation (15%)</b> <b>(OLR AIT 1.1)</b> -Exploration of dataset, proper preprocessing, correct augmentation	No exploration; preprocessing steps missing/inappropriate; no augmentation	Some exploration performed but superficial or incomplete; preprocessing applied inconsistently or with minor issues; augmentation present but limited, unjustified, or poorly integrated	Dataset thoroughly explored; preprocessing steps correct and appropriate for the task; augmentations relevant and correctly implemented	Everything in “Meets” + successful implementation of at least one appropriate extension from Data Strategy & Robustness Testing
<b>Model Training &amp; Optimization (20%)</b> <b>(OLR AIT 1.1)</b> -Baseline training, tuned variant, scratch CNN, logging, reproducibility	Baseline model fails to train or is missing; no hyperparameter tuning; no scratch CNN; no logging or reproducibility; major code issues preventing proper execution.	Baseline trains correctly, but hyperparameter tuning is incomplete or incorrectly done; scratch CNN missing or only partially implemented; logging limited or inconsistent; experiment setup poorly documented.	Baseline model + one tuned hyperparameter with 3 well-chosen values; both pretrained and scratch CNN models correctly trained for a fair comparison (5–15 epochs); proper use of a logging tool (e.g., TensorBoard or equivalent).	Everything in “Meets” + one or more correctly executed extensions from Model Exploration & Advanced Architectures
<b>Explainability &amp; Visual Interpretation (15%)</b> <b>(OLR AIT 1.2)</b> -Grad-CAM images, error analysis, interpretation quality	No XAI method; incorrect/misleading visuals	Some visualizations (<5 or unclear); Grad-CAM applied but interpretation weak; error analysis missing or superficial.	At least 5 clear Grad-CAM visualizations; includes at least 3 misclassified cases; reasonable explanations with critical discussion	Everything in “Meets” + meaningful use of additional XAI techniques (e.g., Integrated Gradients, occlusion)
<b>Evaluation and Analysis (25%)</b> <b>(OLR AIT 1.2)</b> <b>(OLR AIT 2.1)</b> -Metrics, comparisons, training curves, quality of reasoning, conclusions	Missing or incorrect evaluation; only basic metrics reported without context	Some correct metrics but analysis is minimal or shallow; comparisons incomplete (e.g., missing tuned model or missing scratch CNN); training curves unclear or missing.	Multiple relevant metrics used correctly; clear comparison between baseline, tuned model, and scratch CNN; training curves included for all models; strengths and weaknesses thoughtfully discussed in 1–2 focused paragraphs per section; conclusions follow logically from results.	Everything in “Meets” + correct implementation and discussion of deployment extension

**Oral Defense (25%)**  
**(OLR AIT 1.2)**

Assesses each student’s individual understanding of their group’s work, ability to explain decisions, and correctness of reasoning.

**A student who receives “Does not meet” on the oral defense fails the entire project, regardless of written score.**

Cannot explain key parts of the project; cannot interpret their own models, plots, or Grad-CAM results; contradicts written work; demonstrates major misunderstandings of core methods; clear evidence of non-participation or lack of ownership.	Understands some elements but with notable gaps; explanations require prompting; difficulty discussing rationale behind decisions; some inconsistency in detail but basic ownership demonstrated.	Clear, correct explanations of all project components; consistent understanding of preprocessing, TL strategy, tuning choices, CNN architecture, evaluation metrics, and XAI results; confident and coherent responses.	Demonstrates exceptional insight; articulates limitations, alternatives, and deeper reasoning; connects model performance to dataset properties or architectural choices; shows mastery beyond the written report.
---	---	---	--