

## Final Project Marking Standard

Guiliang Liu

Due on Dec 25th

## 1 Literature Review

- Relation to RL (20 Points).
  - **(20/20) points.** The selected topic is closely related to Reinforcement Learning.
  - **(15/20) points.** The selected topic is related to Reinforcement Learning or relevant topics.
  - **(10/20) points.** The selected topic is merely related to Reinforcement Learning or relevant topics.
  - **(5/20) points.** The selected topic is poorly related to Reinforcement Learning or relevant topics.
  - **(0/20) points.** The selected topic has no relation to Reinforcement Learning.
- Completeness (20 Points).
  - **(20/20) points.** Comprehensive coverage of relevant literature.
  - **(15/20) points.** Thorough coverage of most relevant literature.
  - **(10/20) points.** Adequate coverage of literature, but may miss some important works.
  - **(5/20) points.** Incomplete coverage of literature with significant omissions.
  - **(0/20) points.** Literature coverage is insufficient and lacks relevance.
- Writing (20 Points).
  - **(20/20) points.** The writing is perfect, and the terminologies are both proper and precise. Flawless adherence to citation and formatting standards.
  - **(15/20) points.** The writing is excellent, some terminologies are problematic. Minor errors in citation or formatting may be present.
  - **(10/20) points.** The writing is satisfying, without significant grammar errors or inappropriate terminology. Several errors in citation or formatting that do not hinder comprehension.
  - **(5/20) points.** The writing is acceptable, with some grammar errors and problematic terminology. Multiple citation or formatting errors that detract from readability.
  - **(0/20) points.** The writing is not acceptable, with lots of grammar errors and problematic or inappropriate terminology. Numerous citation or formatting errors, indicating a lack of understanding.
- Organization (20 Points).
  - **(20/20) points.** Strong organizational structure with clear subheadings.
  - **(15/20) points.** Clear organization, but may lack some logical sequencing.
  - **(10/20) points.** Organization is adequate, but transitions between themes may be weak.
  - **(5/20) points.** Poor organization and lack of clear subheadings.

- **(0/20) points.** No discernible organization or logical structure.
- Analysis and Discussion (20 Points).
  - **(20/20) points.** Critical analysis and synthesis of existing research.
  - **(15/20) points.** Analysis of literature is present, though less critical or insightful.
  - **(10/20) points.** Descriptive rather than analytical, with limited synthesis.
  - **(5/20) points.** Minimal critical analysis, with mostly summary present.
  - **(0/20) points.** Absence of critical analysis, with no synthesis of the material.

## 2 Academic Project

- Overall Structure (20 Points).
  - **(20/20) points.** Paper is logically organized with smooth transitions; all sections contribute to the paper's goals.
  - **(15/20) points.** Well-structured with a few lapses in organization or clarity.
  - **(10/20) points.** Adequate organization but with noticeable flaws in flow and coherence.
  - **(5/20) points.** Disorganized with poor flow; sections do not form a cohesive whole.
  - **(0/20) points.** Lacks any logical structure, with sections that do not fit together to support a central thesis or goal.
- Methods (20 Points).
  - **(20/20) points.** Novel, Detailed and replicable; every step is clearly outlined.
  - **(15/20) points.** Adequately described but may lack some detail, clarity, or novelty.
  - **(10/20) points.** Describes methods but with insufficient detail for replication and lack of novelty.
  - **(5/20) points.** Complementary, Vague, and lacks detail, making replication difficult.
  - **(0/20) points.** So vague that the methodological approach is unclear. No novelty.
- Writing (20 Points).
  - **(20/20) points.** The writing is perfect, and the terminologies are both proper and precise. Flawless adherence to citation and formatting standards.
  - **(15/20) points.** The writing is excellent, some terminologies are problematic. Minor errors in citation or formatting may be present.
  - **(10/20) points.** The writing is satisfying, without significant grammar errors or inappropriate terminology. Several errors in citation or formatting that do not hinder comprehension.
  - **(5/20) points.** The writing is acceptable, with some grammar errors and problematic terminology. Multiple citation or formatting errors that detract from readability.
  - **(0/20) points.** The writing is not acceptable, with lots of grammar errors and problematic or inappropriate terminology. Numerous citation or formatting errors, indicating a lack of understanding.
- Results (20 Points).
  - **(20/20) points.** Precisely presented with appropriate use of tables and figures; data is clear and accurate.

- **(15/20) points.** Presents data clearly but may have minor errors or be less impactful in presentation.
  - **(10/20) points.** Shows results but with some confusion or lack of clarity.
  - **(5/20) points.** Unclear and poorly presented, making interpretation challenging.
  - **(0/20) points.** Disorganized to the point of being unintelligible or missing entirely.
- Discussion (20 Points).
    - **(20/20) points.** Offers deep insight into the implications of the results and relates findings to existing knowledge.
    - **(15/20) points.** Discusses findings but may miss some connections to broader concepts or literature.
    - **(10/20) points.** Makes an attempt to interpret results but lacks depth or significance.
    - **(5/20) points.** Limited discussion of results, with minimal connection to the research question.
    - **(0/20) points.** Does not offer any meaningful interpretation of results or relate to the research question.