

CS/CSYS 352 – Final Project Presentation/Write-Up Rubric

	Exemplary (4)	Accomplished (3)	Developing (2)	Beginning (1)
Problem Statement 10%	<input type="checkbox"/> Project's objectives are clearly and persuasively stated. Graduate students identify connections to their current research or thesis goals, if appropriate	<input type="checkbox"/> Some minor lack of clarity in scope and purpose of proposed work	<input type="checkbox"/> Primary objective and motivation of work are not clearly mentioned	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to find specific details for scope and purpose of proposed work
Related Work 10%	<input type="checkbox"/> Relevant prior works (scholarly and textbook material, as they compare to the method and/or problem domain) are acknowledged and compared to, providing relevant references and citations, where appropriate. If similar work has been done previously, articulate how you expect your proposed work to be similar and/or different.	<input type="checkbox"/> Prior work is acknowledged, but sources are not properly cited, referenced, and compared to current work	<input type="checkbox"/> Some prior works are noted, but not clear how they relate to current project	<input type="checkbox"/> Little attempt is made to find or acknowledge work of others
Methodology 20%	<input type="checkbox"/> Methodology employed is clearly articulated, and in enough detail that a classmate could implement the high-level ideas of your project, if needed. Specific mention of what aspects of your proposed methodology is novel or unique from what we have done previously in class (and/or has been done in the literature).	<input type="checkbox"/> Methodology is mostly clear, but with some high-level gaps. Perhaps unclear how this approach is new/different compared to past assignments or scholarly works.	<input type="checkbox"/> While the goals or motivations of an algorithm or application may be provided, there is little description of the approach or implementation.	<input type="checkbox"/> No plan for, or description of, methodology is included.
Results 20%	<input type="checkbox"/> Experimental results are clearly provided. Easy to read (and well labeled) figures or tables are presented. Multiple experimental conditions, with p-values from statistical significance tests are provided if/when appropriate. Multiple trials within each condition and confidence bounds are presented when appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Results are generally intuitive, but may lack some clarity in presentation, or lack of experimental rigor from multiple trials/conditions when obvious that these would be appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> Minimal results provided, those provided difficult to interpret.	<input type="checkbox"/> Results not given.

<p>Discussion</p> <p>20%</p>	<p>❑ Results are analyzed to ask if they make intuitive sense, what they imply for the problem statement of the project, and what broader implications they may suggest. Knowledge and intuition of the field of EC are given to support why the results may have turned as out as they did (in the case of both positive or negative findings).</p>	<p>❑ Analysis of results are given, but lacking depth of intuition or generalization. Deep understanding of the relevant concepts from class is not clear.</p>	<p>❑ Results are commented on, but analysis is shallow and does not tie into the researchers expectations, intuition, or lessons-learned. Little background or general knowledge from the class is demonstrated.</p>	<p>❑ Broader discussion and analysis of the results is not given.</p>
<p>Future Work</p> <p>10%</p>	<p>❑ Areas of future investigation are given that naturally follow from results and discussion. Broad knowledge of the field from class is demonstrated in additional research hypothesis generation.</p>	<p>❑ Future potential areas of investigation are listed, but are only immediate and obvious follow-ups from results are don't suggest a broader scope of open questions in the field.</p>	<p>❑ Future areas of work are unclear, or are not connected to the proposed or completed research.</p>	<p>❑ Potential areas for future exploration not given.</p>
<p>Proposal Presentation</p> <p>10%</p>	<p>❑ Clearly and succinctly articulates intent and scope of project to the class, genuinely and critically considers constructive feedback from classmates.</p>	<p>❑ Some major areas of the project unclear; lack of deep and critical thought on suggestions and feedback.</p>	<p>❑ Proposed and completed work is not clearly conveyed, relative to written proposal.</p>	<p>❑ Presentation to class not given (in the absence of an excused absence in class).</p>