1 Rubric and instruction for graders

Assessment sheet PDM project

Your work needs to meet the following requirements in order to be marked:

Requirement	Ok?
Report: maximum 4 pages in provided template	Y/N
Presentation: stays within the allotted time	Y/N
Code: is provided	Y/N

Table 1: Knockout criteria

Your work will be assessed using the following rubrics:

Levels (points) Criteria	Insufficient (3)	Sufficient (6)	Good (8)	Excellent (10)
Presentation: Model and planning S2	Several elements missing or incorrect	Model or planning method introduced	Both correct	and well motivated
Presentation: Results S3	Inconclusive results	Results are presented	and properly described/justified	and satisfactory results shown (in a video)
Presentation: Discussion S4	Several elements missing or incorrect	Minimal discussion on performance	Correct discussion on performance	and shortcomings

Table 2: Rubric of presentation for project PDM. The relevant sections are specified with SX, with X the number as in the deliverables (see description of the project).

Levels (points) Criteria	Insufficient (3)	Sufficient (6)	Good (8)	Excellent (10)
Report: Introduction S1	Several elements missing or incorrect	Contains a description of the work and reference to materials employed	and a valid justification of the chosen methods	and a detailed comparison with respect to state of the art
Report: Model S2A	Several elements missing or incorrect	Minor errors in the formulation	Mathematical formulation is correct	Mathematical formulation is correct and variables are individually explained
Report: Work- /Configuration- space S2B	Wrong spaces described	Minor errors in the formulation	Mathematical formulation is correct and variables are individually explained	and good description
Report: Planning S4	Several elements missing or incorrect	Minor errors in formulation	Algorithm and description are correct and variables are explained	and correctly adapted to the robot model
Report: Results S5	The performance is not shown or the evaluation is not sufficient	The performance of the planner is verified in simulation and evidence is provided	descriptions are clear and relevant	evaluated in multiple scenarios and performance statistics are given
Report: Discussion S6A	Several elements missing or incorrect	Theoretical and practical discussions with minor shortcomings	are all correct and justified	and are complete (the main theoretical and practical aspects are discussed)
Report: Future works S6B	Improvements not discussed or wrong justification	Improvements are discussed and valid, with minor shortcomings	are correct	and justified

Table 3: Rubric of report for project PDM. The relevant sections are specified with SX, with X the number as in the deliverables (see description of the project).

Levels (points) Criteria	0	+ 0.5	+1	- 0.5	- 1
Originality	Basic extension of exercises/lect ure	Some element of novelty/difficulty wrt lecture and/or exercises	Complex project with several elements of novelty/difficult y		
Implementation	Existing code used with very minor improvement s	Methods implemented, partially relying on existing code	Difficult methods implemented		Only existing code is used and the sources are not described in the introduction
Late submission	Submitted on-time			Late submission 0.5 x number of days	
Number of pages	Page limit OK			Additional pages 0.5 x extra page	
Code			Code is provided with read me and runs out of the box following the instructions		

Table 4: Bonus and negative points

Your assignment grade will be decided as follows:

[Group grade] = sum([Part grade]/10 x [Percentage part]) + bonus,

(maximum 100%)

where the percentage of each part is specified in the assignment description.

[Individual grade] = [Individual performance factor] x [Group grade]	(maximum 100%)
where [Individual performance factor] = 1 unless otherwise specified by the group me course.	mbers at the end of the
The final grade is then: [Individual grade]/10, rounded at one decimal point.	