

	Rating				Score
	10	8	6	4	
<b>Report. Technical correctness/depth (10%)</b>	<p>Excellent understanding and introduction of terminology.</p> <p>Clearly introduced and justified methodology and features.</p> <p>Clear definition and justification of metrics.</p> <p>Limitations and strengths of evaluation methodology described.</p>	<p>Correct understanding and introduction of terminology.</p> <p>Introduced and justified methodology and features.</p> <p>Definition and justification of metrics.</p> <p>Evaluation described.</p>	<p>Mostly correct understanding and introduction of terminology.</p> <p>Introduced OR justified methodology and features.</p> <p>Definition OR justification of metrics.</p> <p>Limited evaluation.</p>	<p>Understanding of the topic is insufficient.</p> <p>Insufficient introduction and justification of the methodology and features.</p> <p>Insufficient definition and justification of metrics.</p> <p>No evaluation.</p>	
<b>Report. Results and Discussion (10%)</b>	<p>Clearly presented and summarised results.</p> <p>Use of multiple suitable metrics.</p> <p>Robust comparison of different results.</p> <p>Rich discussion of limitations of results, including poor and surprising results.</p>	<p>Sufficient and complete results presented.</p> <p>Use of a single well defined metric, or multiple but not completely suitable metrics.</p> <p>Some comparison of different results</p> <p>Sufficient discussion of limitations of results.</p>	<p>Incomplete, but sufficient results.</p> <p>At least ONE suitable metric.</p> <p>Limited comparison of results.</p> <p>Limited discussion of limitations of results.</p>	<p>Insufficient results.</p> <p>Unsuitable metric or no evaluation metric used.</p> <p>Insufficient comparison of results.</p> <p>No discussion of limitation of results.</p>	
<b>Report. Writing, background &amp; context (10%)</b>	<p>Grammatically correct, no (very few) spelling errors.</p> <p>Balanced and complete background and context.</p> <p>Adheres to the 7-8 page limit (excluding references).</p> <p>Well organized, demonstrates logical sequencing and structure.</p>	<p>Few grammar and spelling mistakes</p> <p>Mostly complete background and context.</p> <p>Exceed or does not meet page limit by a small margin (&lt; 0.5 page)</p> <p>Well organized, but demonstrates illogical sequencing or structure.</p>	<p>Readable but a significant number of spelling/grammar mistakes</p> <p>Significant errors or omissions in background and context.</p> <p>&gt;8 pages</p> <p>Weakly organized with no logical sequencing or structure.</p>	<p>Some sentences/ paragraphs are unreadable.</p> <p>Context is missing or incorrect.</p> <p>&lt;7 pages</p> <p>No organization, sequencing, or structure.</p>	
<b>Interview (understanding, insights) (15%)</b>	<p>Excellent description of terminology and theory.</p> <p>Clearly justified methodology and features.</p> <p>Clear definition and justification of metrics.</p> <p>Limitations and strengths of evaluation methodology described.</p>	<p>Correct description of terminology.</p> <p>Justified methodology and features.</p> <p>Definition and justification of metrics.</p> <p>Evaluation described.</p>	<p>Mostly correct description of terminology.</p> <p>Justified methodology OR features.</p> <p>Definition OR justification of metrics.</p> <p>Limited evaluation.</p>	<p>Understanding and description of the topic is insufficient.</p> <p>Insufficient justification of the methodology or features.</p> <p>Insufficient definition and justification of metrics.</p> <p>No evaluation.</p>	
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>					