REPORT RUBRIC GRADING

Abstract

(4) Summarizes the Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion with the most important details of the report succinctly. Can understand the report easily by reading the abstract.

(3) Summarizes the Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion with some relevant details. Gives a good impression of what the report is about, but some aspects are not clear.

(2) Vague summary of the report – the goal of the project is provided – but not very informative.

(1) Lacking any meaningful summary of the report.

(0) Missing the abstract.

INTRODUCTION

Motivation & Research Aim

(4) The Background and Motivation is engaging and demonstrates the importance of the topic. Research Aim is clearly stated including the contributions of the overall project.

(3) The Background and Motivation is a straight forward explanation of the topic. Research Aim and workflow figure is provided as well. But either part could use a bit more detail with respect to details regarding the topic itself or the overall project application.

(2) The Background and the Research Aim are present, but both are a little general (i.e., sparse in details) and lacking in depth.

(1) Lacking any meaningful explanation of the importance of report topic. Research Aim provides very little detail the regarding the contributions of the project.

(0) Missing Background and Motivation, and Research Aim.

Workflow Figure

(4) The workflow figure clearly demonstrates visually, the key steps of the processing pipeline of the entire project, demonstrating what the input data, methodological steps, and output results are.

(3) The workflow is demonstrated the overall processing pipeline of the report, but some the visual details are glossed over or are not clear.

(2) The workflow figure is very basic, but sense of the processing pipeline is still obtained.

(1) The workflow shows minimum effort and not informative.

(0) Workflow figure is missing

Related Work

(4) Excellent review of all related literature with respect to research topic, including influence on the citations to the overall research field.

(3) At least 5 citations are included, however their explanations were a little general.

(2) The presented citations were not discussed with sufficient detail.

(1) A good portion of the explanations of the related studies are missing or they are just simply listed.

(0) Missing citations and related work.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Dataset Description

(4) The dataset was explained in detail demonstrating an understanding of the problem space (i.e., source of the data) and the nature of the data (i.e., features and preprocessing). Clear examples of the data were also provided that aided the understanding of the data.

(3) Some minor details regarding the dataset, e.g., features and/or preprocessing, were missing, but the overall section was still understandable. Examples of the data were provided but could have been organized clearer.

(2) Aspects of the dataset were not explained with sufficient detail. Examples of the dataset were missing or examples were poor.

(1) Significant gaps with respect to the explanation of the dataset demonstrates a lack of understanding of the project. Examples of the dataset were missing or examples were poor

(0) Very little detail regarding the dataset is present or is missing. Examples of the dataset were missing or examples were poor

Methods and Experimental Setup

(4) The methods were explained in detail, demonstrating an understanding of the tools and problem space. The experiment details were also presented clearly including the evaluations methods.

(3) Some minor details regarding the methods or experiments were missing, but the overall section was still understandable and demonstrates understanding of the project.

(2) The methods or experiments were not explained with sufficient detail, but the overall project implementation is reasonable.

(1) Significant gaps of with respect to the methodology demonstrates a lack of understanding of the project.

(0) Very little detail is present or missing.

RESULTS/DISCUSSION

Demonstration of results and/or comparison

(4) Results are presented for the project, with the appropriate description regarding the findings of the results, including baseline comparisons. Excellent use of tables and figures help to understand the results.

(3) Results were presented but there are gaps in implementations, comparisons to baselines methods, and visualization of results in table and figures.

(2) Significant gaps are present in the results obtained from the implementations, comparisons to baselines methods. Visualization of results in table and figures are either poor or are missing.

(1) Results are very poor – baseline may be missing, most of the implementations do not work or are meaningless. No visualizations.

(0) No baseline and results are presented and no plan is presented.

Implications of Results

(4) The analysis and interpretations are strong, and clearly follows the logic of the research and results. This demonstrates an understanding of the methods being implemented.

(3) The analysis is good but there are some significant weaknesses or lapses in the logic or explanations, demonstrating a lack of some understanding of the methods.

(2) The analysis is uninteresting or uninspired, tending toward description. Demonstrates a lack of understanding of techniques and results.

(1) There is little interaction and connection between results and analysis. Minimal evidence for understanding of techniques and results.

(0) Analysis is nearly non-existent, weak, minimal and unsupported by results. No understanding demonstrated regarding the work presented.

Limitations

(4) Excellent discussion of the shortcomings of the methods and results obtained in the report.

(3) Discussion of the problems in the methods applied was relevant but was missing some key details.

(2) Some limitations of the report are discussed but mostly lacking in relevance.

(1) The limitations provided do not really address the issues with the chosen methodologies and results.

(0) Very Poor or Missing.

Conclusions

(4) Excellent summary of the overall report, with a focus on the important findings and good outlook for future work.

(3) Summary and future were relevant but could have been more specific in terms of outlook.

(2) Some relevant points were discussed overall missed the mark in terms of summarizing and providing an outlook.

(1) Did not really summarize the report properly and the future work was very general.

(0) Was not relevant to the report or missing.

References

(4) Excellent, many relevant citations were used.

(3) Minimum number of citations were provided.

(2) Minimum number of citations were provided but some were questionable.

(1) Some citations were missing or were not of good quality.

(0) Relevant citations were not used.

Report Clarity

(4) Paper is easy to follow and template is used properly.

(3) There are a few minor problems in the text (such as typos and grammar) and template format (such as text captions, references, or wasn't used properly).

(2) Some problems are present with the language of the text (language is unclear and/or shallow) which effects the technical aspects and analysis of the report. There are some problems with the template as well.

(1) Significant problems are present with the language of the text (language is murky, confused and difficult to follow) which effect the understanding of the technical aspects of the paper. Template is not used properly.

(0) The paper does not follow a scholarly format in either technical or template format.

Code

(4) Excellent documentation and working.

(3) Documentation is provided (but with some components not clear) and working.

(2) Code is working but documentation is not clear.

(1) Code is work and no documentation.

(0) Very Poor or Missing.

Technical Quality

(4) Difficult problem to solve, and to implement. Significant problem solving was required. Significant data collection and preprocessing needed.

(3) Problem tackled was somewhat difficult. Significant data collection and preprocessing needed was also needed.

(2) Straightforward implementation, but significant data collection and preprocessing was applied.

(1) Minor technical challenges were overcome in the project.

(0) No significant challenges overcome in the project.