

# **Assessment 3: Project Report - Capstone Research**

## Overview

During this assessment, you will produce a written report on a computer vision data science project utilising AWS as the primary data repository and computational resource.

## **Learning outcomes**

### this is the proper ruberic

- 1. Analyse real world computer vision tasks using machine learning techniques learnt in this subject
- 2. Engage AWS cloud computing services
- 3. Develop and deploy neural network models on AWS
- 4. Tune hyperparameters for neural network models using AWS
- 5. Construct a written communication and interpretation of machine learning methodologies
- 6. Demonstrate and apply advanced theoretical and technical knowledge of data science to research problem.

#### **Format**

You will need to submit the following:

- A PDF file clearly shows the assignment question, the associated answers, relevant Python outputs, analyses and discussions
- Appendices include screen-shot images of AWS console detailing the development, training and deploying the CNN model
   put this in the actual report document - diana
- Jupyternotebook
   include the code in the report. eg. s3 buckets, how youve got things set up. periodically show a screenshot of the interface in aws. Screenshots are evidence that you have actually done it on aws. show outputs, show that its done the training
- The task cover sheet
   excluding diagrams screenshots and code snippets
- The assignment should not exceed 12-A4 pages. Appendices do not form part of the page limit.

You have up to three attempts to submit your assessment, and only the last submission will be graded.

# A word on plagiarism

Plagiarism is the act of using another's words, works or ideas from any source as one's own.

Plagiarism has no place in a University. Student work containing plagiarised material will be subject to formal university processes.



# **Computer vision**

Computer vision is an expanding field in data science, being led by business applications. Computer vision applications range from analysing static photographs (drone images, satellite imagery, static albums), interactive image albums and content (such as Facebook, Instagram and Twitter), to live steaming of video (cctv, drone/satellite video).

## **Assessment Tasks**

The purposes of the assignment are to i) develop a research proposal relating to image classification/detection using your own dataset; and ii) implement basic neural networks to address the research questions.

**Note:** Please note that a dataset **must NOT** be covered in practical sessions (e.g. MNIST or CIFAR-10/100, dogsvscats). Model Deployment in this report must be conducted using AWS SageMaker.

The report must cover the following aspects.

longish paragraph circle back and evaluate if you achieved this objective in the conclusion

1. Research proposal (4 marks) $^{[13.3\%]}$ 

what would be the reason you would want to be doing this do research and say the prevelance of your problem

support

use and explain what type of batch you used and why!

use references to back it up

- a) Describe the primary objectives/questions from a research.
- b) Discuss some literature relating to the proposal research.

2. Data (3 marks) 10%

- a) Document any data cleaning/formatting tasks required for the image classification task.
- 3. Modelling (10 marks) [33,3%]
  - a) Propose a baseline CNN to address the research proposal. Explain the structure of the benchmark model in detail. At least, consider the following criteria when designing and training the baseline model:
    - Early stopping
      - Drop-out

this can be done using hp.choice provided by keras hyperparameter tuner

- Using batches to train the baseline model
- Considering at least 2 optimisers and different learning rates when selecting the baseline model
- Considering different hidden layers
- **b)** Provide evidence of completed training on AWS. Script mode training is required.
- 4. Model Evaluation and Deployment using AWS-SageMaker (6 marks)
  - a) Evaluate and Discuss the performance of the model for the training and test data.

    Provide relevant graphs, metric measures and evidence of an endpoint on AWS. —
  - b) Evaluate and Discuss the degree to which the model meets your research objectives.
- 5. Discuss the use of AWS SageMaker (2 marks) [6.6%]

endpoint is a url that gives your model access to the resources it needs to run. this model can then be run externally at any time. you need to create and shut down the endpoint when you are done using it.

resize
resample
say that the rotation stuff isnt required since there is enough data



At least discuss the following aspects:

- a) Notebook instance type
- b) Cost and computation time
- 6. Transfer-learning and Model comparison (5 marks)

justify which one you chose (maybe it was trained on similar data) perhaps compare multiple pretrained models.

[16.6%] a) Use one of the pretrained CNN structures via Keras Application API

https://keras.io/api/applications/ to do transfer learning to address objectives of

a hugging face one would be fine as well it doesnt your research. Compare the results obtained from transfer learning and those obtained from the benchmark models. Discuss the results. Script mode training is required.

rather than a notebook with everything, the preferred approach has a separation of concern

model.py -> building the model (define the layers, and the tuner etc) main.ipynb -> everything else, like importing the data and evaluating the model

this means any notebook can call the model

**Data Source** 

Some data source you might find helpful

- https://data.mendeley.com/research-data/?type=IMAGE
- https://www.kaggle.com/datasets

# Marking Criteria and Rubric: MA3832 Assessment 4

| Criteria                 | High Distinction                                | Pass                                       | Fail                      |
|--------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Review the article       | Demonstrate excellent understanding on the      | Demonstrate good understanding on          | Does not meet pass crite- |
|                          | selected article. Provides detailed, accurate   | the selected article. Provides adequate    | ria – See commentary for  |
|                          | descriptions of CNN structure presented in a    | descriptions of CNN structure pre-         | specific details.         |
|                          | paper.  | sented in a paper.                         |                           |
|                          | Demonstrate excellent understanding on con-     |  |                           |
|                          | tributions and limitations of a paper.          | Demonstrate general understanding on       |                           |
|                          |   | contributions and limitations of a paper.  |                           |
| Project proposal de-     | Project plan is coherently and logically struc- | Project plan is structured so that with    | Does not meet pass crite- |
| sign. Logically arrange, | tured. Its impact is clear and well-defined.    | some inferences, a logically structure in- | ria – See commentary for  |
| present and communi-     |   | corporating adequate detail that can be    | specific details.         |
| cate the information of  |   | deduced. Some inaccurate statements        |                           |
| analysis and compari-    |   | and limited justifications.                |                           |
| son                      |   |  |                           |
|                          | Communication is clear, concise, accurate and   | Communication is adequate with some        |                           |
|                          | uses appropriate terminology and references     | ambiguous and inferred elements.           |                           |
|                          | to relevant theoretical frameworks.             | Some replications and not all internal     |                           |
|                          |   | and external sources are appropriately     |                           |
|                          |   | referenced.                                |                           |
|                          |   |  |                           |

|                         |   |  | Does not meet pass crite- |
|-------------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| Data considerations for | Provides a detailed, accurate description of      | Provides adequate description of the   | ria – See commentary for  |
| machine learning anal-  | the data used in the project.                     | data used in the project. Some ele-    | specific details          |
| ysis                    |   | ments of the method are inferred or    |                           |
|                         |   | partially detailed.                    |                           |
|                         |   |  |                           |
|                         |   |  |                           |
|                         |   |  |                           |
|                         |   |  |                           |
|                         |   |  | Does not meet pass crite- |
| Model and Model Eval-   | Provides a detailed, accurate and descrip-        | Provides an adequate description of    | ria – See commentary for  |
| uation                  | tion of the proposed model. The model is          | the proposed model where some ele-     | specific details          |
|                         | clearly visualised, and the visualisation is      | ments are inferred or ambiguous.       |                           |
|                         | clearly and concisely described.                  | The model is visualised, but the visu- |                           |
|                         |   | alisation is not completely described, |                           |
|                         |   | or elements are inferred or ambigu-    |                           |
|                         |   | ous.                                   |                           |
|                         |   |  |                           |
|                         | Hyperparameter tuning is clearly and concisely    | Hyperparameter tuning described with   |                           |
|                         | described with overt justifications link to model | some inferred or ambiguous links to    |                           |
|                         | theory and supporting literature.                 | model theory or supporting literature. |                           |
|                         |   |  |                           |
|                         |   |  |                           |
|                         | Model development draws upon unit                 | Model development draws upon unit      |                           |
|                         | knowledge and demonstrated wider readings         | knowledge and limited wider readings   |                           |

|                    | with clear overt links to external sources.       | with some links to external sources.     |                           |
|--------------------|---|--|---------------------------|
|                    | Model overfitting and regularisation ele-         | Model overfitting and regularisation     |                           |
|                    | ments are clearly and concisely justified with    | elements are described with limited      |                           |
|                    | links to model theory.                            | links to model theory. Some ele-         |                           |
|                    |   | ments are inferred or ambiguous.         |                           |
|                    |   |  |                           |
|                    | Provide detailed explanation on performance       | Provide some explanation on perfor-      |                           |
|                    | of the model                                      | mance of the model                       |                           |
|                    |   |  |                           |
|                    |   |  |                           |
| Model comparison   | Provides a detailed comparison and discus-        | Provide limited comparison and dis-      |                           |
|                    | sion regarding performance of the proposed        | cussion regarding performance of the     |                           |
|                    | model and the model proposed in the re-           | proposed model and the model pro-        |                           |
|                    | viewed in Part 1.                                 | posed in the reviewed in Part 1.         |                           |
|                    |   |  |                           |
|                    | Provide evidence suggesting all models consid-    | Provide some evidence suggesting all     | Does not meet pass crite- |
| Application on AWS | ered in the analysis are successfully trained and | models considered in the analysis are    | ria – See commentary for  |
|                    | deployed.   | successfully trained and deployed.       | specific details          |
|                    |   |  |                           |
|                    | Model deployment, monitoring and mainte-          | Model deployment, monitoring and         |                           |
|                    | nance is clearly and concisely described using    | maintenance is clearly and concisely de- |                           |
|                    | AWS SageMaker services.                           | scribed using AWS SageMaker services.    |                           |
|                    |   |  |                           |
|                    |   |  |                           |
|                    |   |  |                           |