

# Rubric for ADM Projects

Master in Innovation and Research in Informatics

April 16, 2025

**Group members:** Danila Kokin & Haonan Jin & Hang Yao

**Project title:** Boosting

**Evaluator:** Danila Kokin

**Date:** 02.05.25

**Instructions:** for each of the evaluation elements, mark the level which you consider is the most adequate in the following table, along with a numerical score within the respective interval of values (to fine-tune the score). If, in your opinion, some element does not apply, write N/A. Deliver the evaluation only (not the rubric).

Evaluation elements	Levels			
	Exemplary	Satisfactory	Just Right	Unacceptable
	[10 - 9]	(9 - 7]	(7 - 5]	(5-0]
Element 1 (5%)	9.5			
Element 2 (15%)	9.0			
Element 3 (5%)		8.5		
Element 4 (15%)		8.5		
Element 5 (20%)		7.5		
Element 6 (20%)		8.0		
Element 7 (5%)		8.5		
Element 8 (5%)		8.0		
Element 9 (5%)	9.0			
Element 10 (5%)	9.0			

Number	Element	Level (Exemplary)	Level (Satisfactory)	Level (Just Right)	Level (Unacceptable)
1	<b>Title, abstract and cover page</b>	Cover page, title and abstract are succinct but informative, and offer sufficiently specific details about the problem, proposed methods and results	Cover page, title and abstract are OK, offering broad statements about the proposed research study	Cover page, title and abstract need improvement; not very informative	Cover page, title or abstract missing or inappropriate to the given problem, methods used and data generated
2	<b>Introduction section, significance and purpose of the study</b>	Excellent introduction. Articulates reasonable, clear research questions given the purpose. The statements are clearly supported from the findings and state-of-the-art literature	Has a good introduction; the research questions are well stated: and the findings are well introduced	Little description of the problem; the findings are only partial and/or not well introduced	Introduction to the problem, research questions and/or findings are omitted or inappropriate
3	<b>Literature review</b>	The literature review is comprehensive from the peer-reviewed research literature. The problem is appropriately grounded to literature. Project questions are connected to the relevant, reliable literature	The literature review is appropriate but needs to show advantages and limitations of other works	Review of the literature is covered only partially. It has old and/or unreliable references	The review of the literature is missing or inappropriate or consisted of non-research-based articles
4	<b>Methods</b>	The used methods and assumptions are justified and discussed as well as their validity, advantages and limitations. Possible issues in using these methods are reported and discussed	Used methods are justified but their validity, advantages and limitations are partially reported	Provides used methods, but their validity, advantages and limitations are not appropriately justified	Does not mention methods and their validity for the task; advantages and limitations are omitted or inappropriate

Number	Element	Level (Exemplary)	Level (Satisfactory)	Level (Just Right)	Level (Unacceptable)
5	<b>Obtained results</b>	Obtains meaningful results with minimal wasted effort. Provides thorough logical and correct analysis of the data and discusses critically the findings	Produces some results but not enough (or too many). Provides analysis quite sufficiently thorough	Obtains few meaningful results. Provides analysis but only partially correct	Generates no meaningful results. Little meaningful analysis or deliberately incorrect; findings not explained
6	<b>Interpretation and discussions</b>	Provides logical, critical and correct analysis of the data and discusses the findings. Clearly explains how the study supports or disagrees with previous studies and why	Provides logical and correct analysis of the data and discusses the findings, but do not explains how these support or disagree with previous studies	Data analysis is not well covered, does not explains how the results support or disagree with previous studies	No/or inappropriate discussions of the findings. No comparison with previous studies
7	<b>Formulated conclusions</b>	Formulates statements in hindsight, adequately supported by findings	Needs some help in formulating meaningful conclusions	Conclusions are partially meaningful and incomplete	Conclusions are absent, wrong, trivial or unproven
8	<b>Recommendations for future work</b>	Makes insightful recommendations and succinctly addresses perspectives for further research	Makes some good recommendations and perspectives for further research	Makes broad or obvious suggestions for future work	Makes no plausible suggestions for future work
9	<b>English composition</b>	Consistently well written; spelling, grammar, tenses, etc citations, references, headings, table of contents, page numbers and document sections	Manuscript conforms to most standards of English composition	Manuscript contains many mistakes and bad use of tenses	Manuscript contains too many mistakes
10	<b>References and bibliography</b>	The references are appropriate for the statements: they cite books and quality journals; they are up-to-date but cite original papers when appropriate	The references are appropriate but are not up-to-date and/or are not cited appropriately	Citations are not appropriate. References are not supporting the statements	Fails to apply citations, references not appropriate Most of the references are not related to the problem, not up-to-date and/or not cited following the guidelines