NLP Marking Sheet

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | | | Weight | Mark Awarded | Assignment Total | Comments |
| **GROUP ASSIGNMENT**  **(60%)** | **1** | **Introduction of Candidate Techniques** | **10** |  |  |  |
| **2** | **Edit Distance** | **10** |  |  |
| **1** | **Formulation / Design** | **15** |  |  |
| **2** | **Implementation** | **15** |  |  |
| **3** | **Results** | **10** |  |  |
| **PRESENTATION**  **(40%)** | **1** | **Demonstration** | **20** |  |  |  |
| **2** | **Advance Concepts** | **20** |  |  |
| Total Mark of this Module | | | **100** |  |  |  |
| Name (initial) of Marker | | | |  |  |  |
| Signature of Marker | | | |  |  |  |

*See CSFF for feedback. Additional Comments (if applicable):*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Assessment Criteria and Marking Scheme

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Distinction** | **Merit** | **Pass** | **Fail** |
|  | 75 - 100 | 65 - 74 | 50 - 64 | 0 - 49 |
| **GROUP ASSIGNMENT – 60%** |  |  |  |  |
| (1) Introduction of Candidate Techniques (10%) | Excellent review of popular NLP techniques related to the task. There is full, accurate, and professional citations of very recent sources and reliable references with correct format. | Good review of the relevant NLP techniques for the project. Citations are mostly done, and references are up to date, but there are some outdated and non-reliable sources, suitable format. | Satisfactory review of NLP techniques to be used in the project. References and citations are acceptable, but of lesser quality, acceptable format with some mistakes. | Inadequate review and citations of sources, outdated and unreliable references, poor format with many mistakes. |
| (2) Edit Distance (10%) | Excellent description of the Edit Distance concept and variations that may be applicable for the project, with good justifications. | Good description of the Edit Distance concept and variations that may be applicable for the project, with acceptable justifications. | Satisfactory description of the Edit Distance concept and variations that may be applicable for the project. | Poor description of the Edit Distance concept and/or variations, or unacceptable justifications. |
| (3) Formulation / Design (15%) | Very clear and detailed design of effective strategies to detect and correct both Non-words and Real-words spelling errors, GUI and choice of dataset. | Good level of detail in the design of effective strategies to detect and correct both Non-words and Real-words spelling errors, GUI and choice of dataset. | Satisfactory design to detect and correct both types of spelling errors, or very good design to detect and correct one of the types of spelling errors. Satisfactory GUI and choice of dataset. | Inadequate design for a solution to the given task. |
| (4) Implementation (15%) | Identification of excellent libraries and coding as suitable candidate NLP techniques for the given task. The coding is efficient, clean and documented perfectly. | Good libraries and suitable candidate NLP techniques identified. Coding is effective but only documented partly. | Coding is satisfactory, but partly documented with some deficiency. | Coding is weak, and documented with major deficiencies. |
| (5) Results (10%) | System works perfectly, providing all the expected features. Results are well documented. Additional effort taken to ensure the robustness and user-friendliness of the system | System works as expected for all the given requirements. Results are well documented. Effort taken to ensure that the system is able to handle the given tasks with some level of robustness | System delivers most of the requirements and can handle normal expectations with some minor deficiencies. Satisfactory level of results documentation | Unable to meet the requirements, with only partial or no delivery of system. Poor documentation of the results. |
| **DEMONSTRATION – 40%** |  |  |  |  |
| (1) Demo (20%) | Very clear understanding of the benefits and limitations of the NLP techniques. Able to explain and demonstrate all features clearly. Very good answers to all queries. | Good ability to appraise the benefits and limitations of the NLP techniques. Good performance in Q&A. | Satisfactory explanation of the NLP techniques, although with some limitations. Satisfactory performance in Q&A, although with some difficulty. | Weak understanding of the NLP techniques. Inability to present the features and functions or answer questions. |
| (2) Advance Concepts (20%) | Excellent knowledge of how other NLP concepts, especially POS / IR / Semantics, may be used to further enhance the system. | Good knowledge of how other NLP concepts, especially POS / IR / Semantics, may be used to further enhance the system. | Satisfactory knowledge of how other NLP concepts, especially POS/IR/Semantics, may be used to further enhance the system. | Weak or no description of how other NLP concepts, may be used to further enhance the system. |