

EECS 4422/5323 Final Report Rubric (Engineering)

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:
 - Technical content - have you summarized the original work in an accurate manner, and provided an explanation of relevant deviations or components which were insufficiently detailed in the original work and required guesswork or executive decisions on your part? [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.*
 - Evaluation - have you provided sufficient evidence for evaluation which shows that your work does (or does not) reproduce the behaviour of the original system?
 - 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 quality - Has your code been hosted in an online repository location with access granted to your instructor? Does your code run, and perform the functionality described in your written report?
 - User documentation - Does your repository include a readme file with clear step-by-step instructions for installing and running your software? *Note: your code should be runnable in the Linux environment. If this is not possible, or you are concerned about this, please let me know ASAP.*

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
Technical content of written report	The report provides a summary of the original work, and details any relevant differences or unknowns which went into the version produced for this project.	The report provides a partial description of the methodology, but with major details missing or at insufficient detail of description for replication, or contains technical errors.	The report includes numerous errors or a severe lack of necessary detail.	5
Evaluation presented in the written report	The report includes relevant evaluation to compare the performance of the project version with the original method or the general state of computer vision approaches to the topic, including insightful analysis of the model behaviour.	The report provides some evaluation and analysis of the model behaviour, but leaves open important questions regarding model behaviour.	The report fails to adequately characterize the behaviour of the implemented model.	4
Clarity of expression for the written report	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 quality	The code is properly packaged and runs without issue on appropriate test data.	The code is brittle and includes bugs (such as runtime errors or unexpected results) for basic test inputs.	The code does not run or is not made available.	3
User documentation	The code has clear and feasible instructions for setup and execution.	It is possible to get the code running, but the instructions miss some important information (such as required libraries or setup steps).	User instructions are not provided or are sufficiently incorrect to prevent testing of the code.	3