

Rubric for final project evaluation - CSE4350

n/a - not applicable

Criteria	Max points per criterion	0-5 points	6-10 points	11-15 points
Project Idea	15	Not novel. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It has been heavily discussed from a graph machine learning perspective; - Idea is not well motivated and put in context of existing literature. 	Novel. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The idea has been discussed but not thoroughly especially in the context of the project. - Motivation and context are provided and positioned w.r.t. what has been done. 	Novel and original. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Slightly discussed from a graph machine learning or discussed in a different context. - Idea is well motivated and put in context of the graph ML literature; gaps are well pointed out; research questions and/or hypothesis are well elaborated.
Implementation and results	15	Implementation is lacking and results are largely missing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Either baseline or more advanced algorithms are not implemented - Results are wrong, partial, or incomplete 	Method runs and some results are available <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most of the results are available but not all parts of the project are implemented (e.g., baseline, advanced methods, challenges) - Results are correct and only minor things that do not alter the conclusions are missing 	Method runs and all results are available <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All methods are run and results are provided
Analysis / thoroughness / evaluation / Ablation study	15	Major flaws <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wrong analysis of the results - Results do not address conclusively the research question or hypothesis - Evaluation lacks major parts - (if applicable) Ablation study or sensitivity analysis is missing - (if applicable) Theoretical analysis is missing or has major flaws (e.g., derivations / proofs) 	Complete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analysis is complete to address the research question / hypothesis. - Some minor aspects could have reached to a more conclusive answer. - Results corroborate the methodology and lead to insightful findings. - (if applicable) Ablation study or sensitivity analysis is provided but some aspects are missing. - (if applicable) Theoretical analysis is provided but has minor issues or lacks some aspects. 	Excellent and in depth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analysis addresses the research question in detail and leads to at least one follow-up direction to evaluate - Project has been evaluated in all aspects and conclusions are drawn w.r.t. the method part. - (if applicable) Ablation study or sensitivity analysis are provided and to identify key components in the methodology. - (if applicable) Theoretical analysis is rigorous and correct and complements the numerical ones.
Challenges	15	Challenges unaddressed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None of graph ML challenges is addressed. Not implemented and not discussed 	Challenges addressed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least one challenge related to the project is addressed and implemented. 	Challenges well addressed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One challenge related to the project is addressed and implemented. - Another challenge is either implemented or discussed.

Criteria	Max points per criterion	0-5 points	6-10 points	11-15 points
Presentation	10	Unclear presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation lacks detail and does not support conclusions. Irrelevant information presented. - Presentation is unstructured and chaotic. - Poorly expressed and formulated. Unclearly presented. 	Clear presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation has sufficient detail to support conclusions. - Presentation has good logical structure, but needs some improvement. Sufficient use of visual aids. - Expressed and formulated adequately. Most of the time clearly presented 	Excellent presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation has a good level of detail to support the conclusions and to understand the recommendations. - Presentation has very good logical structure, the essentials are clearly separated from the ancillary. Good use of visual aids. - Very well expressed, formulated and clearly presented.
Q&A	30	(0-10 points) Overall unsatisfactory answers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Weak argumentation. Some answers were incorrect or incomplete - Links with the course concepts is weak. - Student lacks substantial knowledge about the project's fundamental concepts. 	(11-20 points) Overall satisfactory answers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Satisfying argumentation. A few questions could benefit from more thoughtful or complete answers. - Answers linked well with the course concepts overall. - Some gaps about fundamental concepts of the project are present. 	(20-30 points) Satisfactory answers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sound argumentation. Well answered questions. - Answers supported by course and/or literature concepts in all aspects. - No fundamental gaps about the project are present.
Clarity of the proposal.	0	0 points: proposal is clear with all elements present. Tables and figures are clear. All parts are in order and details are provided.	- 5 points: proposal could be understood overall but requires some parts to be read more than once. Some minor details are missing.	- 10 points: proposal requires a major effort to understand. Important details are present