

Group Project Assessment Rubrics

(total Points: 100)

1. Project Implementation (Code) (30 Points, assessed by TAs)

Criteria	A (Excellent)	B (Good)	C (Satisfactory)	D (Marginal Pass)	F (Fail)
Code Correctness (10 pts)	Program runs flawlessly, meets all requirements, and handles edge cases.	Program runs correctly for standard cases; minor edge case issues.	Program runs partially but has functional gaps in non-edge cases.	Program runs but produces incorrect outputs for most cases.	Program does not run or crashes entirely; no valid output.
Code Quality (8 pts)	Clean, modular, and efficient code.	Mostly readable, well-structured, but minor inefficiencies or redundancies.	Basic structure but lacks modularity; some duplicated code.	Messy structure, poor naming, minimal organization.	Unreadable code; no effort to follow conventions.
Documentation (e.g., comments, instructions) (12 pts)	Comprehensive in-line comments; clear descriptions of logic and flow; clear instructions for installation and execution (e.g., via README.md or Jupyter notebooks)	Adequate comments; some lack of detail.	Minimal in-line comments; explanations are vague.	Sparse or misleading comments	No comments

2. Project Report (40 Points, assessed by TAs)

Criteria	A (Excellent)	B (Good)	C (Satisfactory)	D (Marginal Pass)/ F (Fail)
Research and Understanding (14 pts)	Comprehensive literature review and clear explanation/comparison of RSA and ElGamal algorithms.	Shows good understanding of the relevant concepts; mostly accurate with some minor gaps.	Basic understanding of the concepts; several inaccuracies or superficial analysis.	Lacks understanding of key concepts; major inaccuracies or misunderstandings.
Application and Innovation (14 pts)	Excellent application of techniques, insightful design, possible innovation.	Applies most concepts correctly; some applications may lack depth or innovation.	Limited application of concepts; basic solutions with minimal innovation.	Fails to apply relevant concepts; no innovative solutions presented.
Organization (6 pts)	Well-structured with clear sections (motivation, related work, method, results, analysis, etc.) that enhance understanding of the content.	Generally organized; some sections may be unclear or poorly structured.	Lacks clear structure; difficult to follow at times.	Disorganized and confusing; no clear structure.
References and Citations (6 pts)	Thoroughly cited all sources in an appropriate format, demonstrating engagement with existing literature.	Cited most sources correctly; minor errors in format.	Inconsistent citations; some important sources missing.	No citations or completely incorrect format.

3. Project Presentation (20 Points, assessed by TAs and Instructor)

Criteria	A (Excellent)	B (Good)	C (Satisfactory)	D (Marginal Pass)/ F (Fail)
Q&A Response Quality (8 pts)	Accurate, insightful answers showing deep understanding; confidently handled unexpected or advanced questions.	Mostly correct answers; some hesitation or gaps.	Partial understanding; vague or incomplete responses.	Cannot answer or consistently incorrect.
Live Demo (8 pts)	Functional, clear, relevant to project goal; demonstrates key pipeline and behaviors.	Present but limited in scope or clarity; not all components shown.	Barely working or unclear; difficult to follow.	No working demo presented.
Content Coverage (4 pts)	All main ideas covered concisely (task, methods, key results).	Most ideas covered, some shallow or skipped.	Missing key parts, hard to follow.	Largely off-topic or incoherent.

4. Peer Evaluation (10 Points, assessed by group members)

Each group member scores every other member on a scale of 0 to 10:

- 0 points: Did not contribute or was unhelpful.
- 5 point: Contributed somewhat but did not meet expectations.
- 10 points: Contributed significantly and was very helpful.

Each member will not score themselves. The individual score for each group member will be calculated as the average of the scores given to them by their peers.

Criteria	Excellent	Fair	Poor
Individual Contribution	Received an average score of 8 to 10 from peers, indicating strong contribution and collaboration.	Received an average score of 5 to 8 from peers, indicating some contribution but with noticeable gaps.	Received an average score below 5 from peers, indicating minimal or no contribution.