	Grades				
	1-2	**3-4**	**5-6**	**7-8**	**9-10**
Code					
Code functioning (15%)	Assignment not handed in on time	Code does not run even after minor changes by the TA. Impossible to grade the project and to assess the performance.	Code barely runs, is really slow, has a lot of warnings, some evident bugs and call unusual dependencies.	Code is well functioning. Some errors are spotted but nothing that stops it from functioning well	Really good quality of code: clean and efficient (9). Could be used instead of the original in a pipeline (10).
Coding style (20%)	Impossible to understand, poor naming policy, no comments.		Variables are poorly chosen, documentation is scarce and no effort has been made to make it readable. No modularity whatsoever. Too many things are hard-coded	Good documentation and good choice of variable names. Consistent naming policy. Good modularity. Code is broken down into subparts which make it easy to understand.	Documentation is easily understandable, variables have straightforward names. Code is modular and reused appropriately. Very efficient. Can be made public with no modifications (10)
Validity (25%)	Result is a random tree. The algorithm does nothing.		A bit better than a random tree, algorithm is implemented only roughly. Does not produce a human readable tree output.	Base-line algorithm has been correctly implemented. Results consistent with the ones given as example. Some bugs can be spotted but they do not seriously affect the results. Produces a human-readable tree output although not in newick format.	Base-line algorithm and the bonus points (handling gaps + local bootstrap + local hill climbing) implemented correctly and produces a valid newick output. No problems or bugs, results in-line with what they should be (9). Made additional contribution to the algorithm that was not part of the manuscript (10)
Video					
Video grade (20%)	Video not submitted in on time	Chaotic presentation. Structure is not followed (no Introduction, method, results).	Structure is followed. The video is difficult to understand. Explanations are hard to follow. Figures/images (if exist) are not explicative. No evidence that the group has actually understood what he did.	Structure is followed and the video is easily understandable. Good use of figures/images. Some points are still questionable but the video gives at least the impression that the group has understood something.	Really good video, also enjoyable to watch. An effort has been made to make it easy to follow and to understand. Structure is totally respected, figures/images are thorough and it is evident that the group masters the subject. Had additional contributions to the algorithm + discussion that were not part of the manuscript and very creative (10)
Reflection					
Reflection grade (20%)	Not submitted on time.	Chaotic text. No structure/storyline, can't follow.	Structure is followed. The text is still difficult to read through. No evidence that the student has actually understood what he did. Not sure about the student's input to the project	Structure is followed and the text is easy to understand. Some points are still questionable but the text gives at least the impression that the student has understood something and had a substantial input to the project.	Really good text, also enjoyable to read. An effort has been made to create a good and very creative storyline. It is evident that the student masters the subject, and has learned a lot during the project. Also has additional discussion/insight about the project (10)