EECS 4422/5323 Final Report Rubric (Scientific)

The final report encompasses the wrap-up of your project, and covers both the written report and the packaging of the code which you have been developing. You will be graded on the following items:

- Written Report:
    - Motivation - have you provided appropriate background information to explain the motivation of your project and place it within the context of the field of computer vision? [5323 only]: Does your report include an appropriate (and appropriately formatted) annotated bibliography? *Please note: the bibliography does not count toward the recommended page count of the report.*
    - Method - does your report describe the details of your project, explaining what you have done, how, and why?
    - Experimental Results - have you provided an appropriate set of experimental tests to explore the chosen problem domain or evaluate the proposed computer vision method?
    - Analysis of Results - have you included analysis of your experimental results which explains how they shed new light on the problem domain of your project, or how the performance of your proposed method relates to other similar approaches in the literature?
    - Clarity of expression - are the details of your project clearly described following a logical flow which aids your reader in understanding the details of your work? Is your report succinct?
- Code Release:
    - Code - Do you provide the instructor with access to the project code?

The rubric for marking is given in the following table. Marks can be also be assigned between columns (e.g. 0.75 or 0.25), and the total mark will be assigned as the sum of the weight times the assigned mark for each criteria (total out of 18).

Criteria	1	0.5	0	Relative Weight
Motivation	Project motivation is clearly explained and placed within the larger field.	Project motivation is only superficially justified, or major prior works are ignored.	Project motivation is unclear.	2
Method	Project methodology is clearly explained and justified.	Some major aspects of the project are not adequately described such that the project could be replicated.	The methodology is missing or unclear to the point of obscuring subsequent analysis.	4
Experimental Results	Evaluation datasets and metrics are appropriately chosen to provide useful insight into the behaviour of the method(s) being explored in the project.	Some experimental tests have been run, but the selection of tests is insufficient in scope for the expectations of the project.	The experimental tests run are inappropriate to the given problem domain, or incorrectly performed.	4
Analysis	Discussion and overall conclusions are logically grounded in the experimental evidence reported, and provide useful insights into the problem domain.	Some of the analysis is incorrect or unsupported by the experimental evidence provided, or the analysis is largely superficial.	The analysis of results is largely missing, or highly incorrect.	4
Clarity of expression	The report is clearly written with an easily followed flow of logic, and succinctly communicates the necessary information.	The report includes a number of leaps in logic which makes it harder to follow, or includes too much material with low relevance.	The content of the report is overly difficult to follow, with frequent use of undefined jargon or variables, and concepts presented out of logical order.	3
Code release	Code is provided		Code is not provided	1