Grading the Project work, Lecture: "Deep Learning"

The basic principle is:

- For the project part 1, you can receive up to $P = 15$ points, for answering the questions (= project part 2), you can also receive up to $Q = 15$ points.
- For outstanding solutions in the project, you can receive up to $E = 15$ extra points.
- P starts with a budget of 15 points, this number is decremented in case of flaws (see examples below).
- The survey is part of project part 1 (if missing, this is a flaw and P will be decremented, as stated below)
- E and Q start with a budget of 0 points and are incremented in case of outstanding results (refers to E) or correct answers in the form (Q).
- The final number of points S is computed by this equation:

$$S = \frac{P \cdot 2 + E + Q}{3}$$

- S is mapped to a grade as follows:

S	Grade:
≥ 14	1.0
13	1.3
12	1.7
11	2.0
10	2.3
9	2.7
8	3.0
7	3.3
6	3.7
5	4.0
4	4.7
≤ 3	5.0

- If parts of your work or your work is not handed in within the due, these parts or the work will be graded with 0 Points.
- If plagiarism was found in any part of your work, the entire work will be graded to 5.0. You may use other sources of information or code, when appropriately cited. However, relevant for the grade is only your own work. Hence, it is not recommended to excessively use other resources.

Examples of flaws which lead to downgrading of P (this is an incomplete list):

Description of flaw	Effect on P
Notebook cannot be executed (and this is the student's fault)	-4...-6 P
Notebook is not additionally available as .pdf file	-2 P
Poor quality of explanations in markdown cells. Hint: Please not only describe *what* the next step is but also describe *why* something has to be done.	-1...-3 P
Poor style of code Hint: If your code is compliant to the Google Python Style Guide (https://github.com/google/styleguide/blob/gh-pages/pyguide.md) you are safe.	-1...-3 P

Obviously poor coding skills / Non-Pythonic way of coding Hint: Use python specific coding (e.g. list comprehensions, dictionaries etc.)	-1...-3 P
Notebook does not fit into the upload space including required dataset but it is provided by other means	-1 P
Project survey not filled out carefully and submitted on time	-3 P
Content-specific flaws:	
Use of VGG although you were asked to use another network architecture	-3 P
Use of own network although you were asked to use transfer learning (if you *additionally* show your own solution, this is perfectly fine and could receive extra points!)	-3 P
Obvious flaws in data handling, data preprocessing	-1... -3 P
Flaws in training the network, e.g. overfitting etc.	-2... -4 P
Mediocre evaluation, presentation of the results and discussion of the results Hint: spend some effort on presenting the results and on the discussion of the results – this is a crucial step!	-2...-6 P
Low performance in terms of classification errors of your solution (compared to expectations)	-1...-3 P

Examples for extra points E:

Description	Effect on P
Very good explanations, structure, and design of the notebook	+1...+5 P
Very clever ways of coping with the problem of getting enough training data (needs to be carefully described)	+1...+5 P
Show additional improvements or additional focus on specific solutions (e.g. show solution which is capable of consuming low resources to run on embedded hardware, combine approach with other approaches, compare performance with other approaches).	+1...+15 P
Elaborate in detail on what to do next to make a real product out of the application	+1...+3 P
Very good discussion of the results	+1...+3 P
Implement and describe own ideas which go beyond the original task	Up to +15 P

Note: Especially when you deliver extra work of your own ideas and improvements, it is essential to carefully describe <u>what</u> you did and <u>why</u>. Otherwise, you won't receive the extra-points as stated above. If the categories of receiving extra points overlap or are not sharply separated, you will not receive the points of both categories. You will get the points calculated for the category which fits best.