CMP466 – Course Project Report Rubric

Criteria	Excellent	Satisfactory	Poor
Abstract & Introduction	**(10 points)** Abstract crisply states objectives, methods, and key findings; Introduction clearly frames the problem and its importance, articulates a precise research question, summarizes your novel contributions, and provides a brief roadmap of the report's sections.	**(5 points)** Abstract and introduction include all elements but may be wordy or miss one nuance; research question and contributions are present but phrasing may be vague; roadmap may omit one or two sections.	**(1 point)** Abstract is vague or overly long; misses objectives or findings; Introduction fails to state the research question or contributions, or omits the report outline.
Literature Review	**(10 points)** Reviews 2–3 papers per team member, summarizing goal, methods, data, metrics, and results; provides critical commentary on strengths/weaknesses, then synthesizes gaps that directly motivate your approach.	**(5 points)** Cites 2–3 relevant papers per member with basic summaries; some critical insight offered, but synthesis of gaps is superficial or generic.	**(1 point)** Fewer than 2 papers per member; summaries incomplete or inaccurate; lacks critical analysis and does not draw clear motivation for your project.
Methods & Datasets	**(10 points)** Thoroughly describes dataset (source, size, dimensionality, class distribution, feature summaries). Clearly explains and justifies preprocessing steps. Accurately presents theory behind machine learning algorithms. Clearly defines evaluation metrics.	**(5 points)** Covers most dataset details; some preprocessing or model theory lacks depth or justification. Metrics defined but may lack full clarity.	**(1 point)** Dataset description incomplete or missing key stats. Preprocessing/model methods are minimal or incorrect. Evaluation metrics are absent or superficially defined.
Results & Evaluation	**(10 points)** Reports preprocessing outcomes clearly. Presents results for all required classifiers with appropriate metrics. Includes hyperparameter-tuning analyses and rationale for chosen values.	**(5 points)** Reports most results and includes some tuning details. Compares models but analysis is surface-level. Visuals are clear but interpretations are basic.	**(1 point)** Results missing for several classifiers or tuning analyses. Comparisons not addressed. Visuals and interpretations are weak or absent.

	Provides deep, insightful interpretation of results.		
Discussion & Conclusions	**(10 points)** Insightfully discusses how your results compare to prior work. Critically analyzes performance differences and practical implications. Clearly identifies limitations and proposes thoughtful future work. Conclusion succinctly summarizes contributions and takeaways.	**(5 points)** Discussion covers main findings and mentions related work; limitations/future work are somewhat generic. Conclusion adequate.	**(1 point)** Discussion lacks depth or fail to compare with related work. Limitations/future work missing or cursory. Conclusion weak or omitted.
Team Contributions & Professionalism	**(10 points)** Roles and individual contributions are transparently documented. Writing is polished, well-organized, and error-free. Citations are accurate and consistently formatted.	**(5 points)** Contributions listed but with minor ambiguities. Writing generally clear with a few errors. Citations mostly correct. Mostly original work; minor AI assistance detected but report shows clear understanding and adaptation of any such content.	**(0 points)** Contribution statement missing or unclear. Writing errors impede readability. Citations missing or incorrect. Large sections appear copied from AI or external sources; no evidence of original problem-solving or adaptation.