

## IS467 Final Report Marking Rubric (Total: 30 Marks)

Section	Marks Allocation	Sub-Criteria	Performance Descriptors	Score	Comments
<b>Methodology</b> Explanation of evaluation using structured scoring; paragraph per section (e.g., CXXX); ≥5 criteria per section with descriptions and rubric (1=Fully Met, 0=Partial, -1=Not Met); repeated for all assigned sections.	8	- Clarity of section descriptions - Completeness and relevance of ≥5 criteria per section - Logical structure and rubric application - Coverage of all assigned evaluation sections	- 8/8: Comprehensive, innovative criteria with precise descriptions and seamless structure across all sections. - 6-7/8: Clear, well-defined criteria with minor gaps in depth. - 5/8: Adequate coverage but limited criteria detail or incomplete sections. - 0-4/8: Few criteria, vague descriptions, or missing sections.	/8	
<b>Results</b> Summary of findings via scoring method; clear Result Summary Table with scores per evaluation area.	4	- Accuracy and completeness of table - Clear summarization of scores - Relevance to methodology	- 4/4: Insightful, error-free table with concise, data-driven summary. - 3/4: Complete table with solid presentation. - 2/4: Basic table but lacks clarity or minor errors. - 0-1/4: Incomplete, inaccurate, or absent table.	/4	
<b>Discussion</b> Interpretation of scores; Key Findings (bullets); Interpretation linking to criteria/literature; ≥3 Recommendations (bulleted, justified); Limitations.	6	- Depth of key findings and interpretation - Relevance of recommendations and justifications - Identification of strengths/weaknesses and limitations - Ties to literature	- 6/6: Critical, nuanced analysis with strong links and practical, evidence-based recommendations. - 5/6: Well-interpreted with relevant recommendations. - 3-4/6: Basic discussion but superficial insights. - 0-2/6: Lacks depth, incomplete elements, or no justification.	/6	
<b>Conclusion</b> Summary of evaluation; Main Insights; Significance of Work; Future Work.	2	- Conciseness and encapsulation of findings - Clarity of insights and significance - Feasibility of future work suggestions	- 2/2: Succinct, impactful synthesis with forward-looking insights. - 1/2: Clear summary with relevant points. - 0/2: Basic recap but lacks depth, or vague/incomplete.	/2	
<b>Group Member Contribution</b> Breakdown of roles (not in page count).	2	- Fairness and completeness of distribution - Specificity of individual contributions	- 2/2: Balanced, detailed assignment with clear evidence of collaboration. - 1/2: Equitable but somewhat vague. - 0/2: Uneven, incomplete, or absent.	/2	
<b>Format, Conciseness, and Clarity</b> Adherence to page limits; clear, concise writing; professional tone and structure.	3	- Overall clarity and readability - Conciseness without loss of detail - Consistent formatting (e.g., Arial 11pt)	- 3/3: Exemplary clarity, tight conciseness, and flawless formatting. - 2/3: Strong execution with minor verbosity or inconsistencies. - 1/3: Adequate but wordy or unclear in parts. - 0/3: Poor structure, overly verbose, or unprofessional.	/3	
<b>Presentation and Slide Quality</b> Delivery of project content (e.g., slides, demo, Q&A; assumed 10-15 min).	5	- Slide design and visual quality - Content organization and coverage - Delivery clarity, engagement, and time management	- 5/5: Professional, visually appealing slides with engaging, well-paced delivery and strong Q&A. - 4/5: High-quality slides and solid presentation with minor issues. - 3/5: Adequate slides and delivery but lacks polish. - 0-2/5: Poor slide design, disorganized content, or ineffective delivery.	/5	