

# Final Report Guidelines

## Report Details

### **Content**

1) Your final report must:

- a) Include a motivation, research hypothesis, connection with literature, proposed methodology, and expected results based on the literature.
- b) Be independent work with no use of AI tools
- c) Use of provided Overleaf template on Brightspace (Content → Final Report → Final Report Template) with all section requirements outlined in a).
- d) Use English language that is generally correct (spelling, grammar, and punctuation) and written in the style of an academic article (tip: use formal English and do not use abbreviations). The reports are not graded for English proficiency, but you are expected to use basic spell check tools to avoid typos and use formal language in your report.
- e) Have a length is no longer than 3-4 pages (*excluding* references and appendices)
- f) Have proper inclusion of examples, figures and tables (with explanatory captions)
- g) Provide a link to your public Github page
- h) Include a formatted bibliography in APA format with the following requirements
  - i) **only peer-reviewed work**
  - ii) include links to each source you used in the bibliography. If you cannot find a working link to the reference, then it should not be in your report since you would not be able to read it.
  - iii) include 1-2 lines describing the rationale of what you used the reference for  
For example, each reference should look like this (APA Style): Last Name, Initials Author 1, Last Name, Initials Author 2.... Title. Journal Name. Volume. Issue. Date. Page #s. <Link to the source>. Rationale: I used this resource to help me narrow down my research question because it gave information about ....

**Reports are individual and original efforts, including no use of AI tools such as ChatGPT.**

The cheating and plagiarism policy of the Faculty of Art applies to this assignment and is written in the syllabus.

## **Report Timeline**

The final project is **due before 12 January 2026 at 23:59.**

The final project has to be uploaded **in two places** by the deadline:

- (1) a .pdf file of your report needs to be uploaded on Brightspace
- (2) a .pdf file of your report needs to be uploaded to your (public) GitHub repository with a link to it in your report itself.

This means that by the deadline, all necessary content has been uploaded (1) to Brightspace and (2) to the GitHub page with a working link provided in the report on Brightspace.

The report will be graded out of 10 points. Late submissions will be penalized as follows:

- up to 8 hours: -1 point
- between 8 and 12 hours: -2 points
- between 12 and 23 hours: -3 points
- 24 hours or more: no correction

## **Report Grading**

Detailed evaluation criteria for the final project are reported below. The final project is graded on a scale from 1-10. A minimum grade of 5.5 is required to pass the course.

All plagiarism and fraud rules outlined in the syllabus apply to the final project, including that it is prohibited to use AI tools (e.g., Chat GPT) for the report. In case of a failing grade, there will be a resit for the final project. See details at the end of the syllabus.

The assessment criteria are divided into 2 blocks: Content and Reporting. The final grade will be calculated by summing together the points for Content and those for Reporting. Content will receive up to 6 points; Reporting will receive up to 4 points. Maximum score will be 10.

The detailed criteria are shown on the next page for Content and Reporting:

Each component of the **Content block** will be marked following the criteria below:

<b>Content</b>	<b>ATROCIOUS-BAD (1-4)</b>	<b>INSUFFICIENT (5)</b>	<b>SUFFICIENT (6)</b>	<b>GOOD (7-8)</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (9-10)</b>
<i>Motivation</i>	the rationale is missing and the study is not contextualised	the rationale is unclear and contextualisation is weak	the rationale is explained sufficiently clearly and the contextualisation is sufficient	the rationale is convincing and clear, the study is well contextualised	the rationale clearly shows that the study is important and the study is very well contextualised
<i>Research question</i>	there is no research question	the research question is unclear, or not linked to topic	sufficiently clear research questions linked to topic	clear and interesting research question that follows from the rationale	very clear, interesting, and challenging research question that follows logically from the rationale
<i>Related Work</i>	lacking	weak (related work only mentioned, but not discussed)	sufficient discussion of related work	critical discussion of related work (e.g. identification of gaps)	insightful, creative and critical discussion of related work
<i>Methodology</i>	lacks description of method	incomplete description of method	sufficient description of method	good description of method	professional description of method
<i>Data</i>	Data are not properly described	Data are described but are not fit to answer the research question	Data are poorly described and fit to answer the research question	Data are nicely described, their selection is fit for to answer the research question	Data are thoroughly described, comparison with other datasets is conducted to justify their selection, data are fit to answer the research question
<i>Presentation Results</i>	unclear and incomplete	not clear and complete	clear and complete (including clear captions)	very clear and comprehensive	exceptionally clear and fully comprehensive
<i>Discussion</i>	lacking	weak (no interpretation of results)	sufficient discussion of interpretation of results	critical discussion of results	insightful, creative and critical discussion of results
<i>Conclusion</i>	lacking	incomplete summary not addressing the research question	(partially) answers the research question	answers the research question and puts the study in a broader context	answers the research question and puts the study in a broader context, with appropriate suggestions for future work
<i>Code</i>	lacks accompanying code	incomplete code (replication not possible)	code poorly documented but allows for replication	good documentation of code, easy to replicate	professional implementation

Each component of the **Reporting block** will be marked following the criteria below:

<b>Reporting</b>	<b>ATROCIOUS-BAD (1-4)</b>	<b>INSUFFICIENT (5)</b>	<b>SUFFICIENT (6)</b>	<b>GOOD (7-8)</b>	<b>EXCELLENT (9-10)</b>
<i>Structure</i>	lacks a clear structure	inconsistent and/or not in agreement with conventions	logically structured in conventional sections	completely in line with contents and follows conventions where necessary	excellent
<i>Coherence</i>	incoherent and difficult to follow	parts of the report are not consistently linked at the level of sections, and paragraphs	parts of the report are sufficiently linked at the level of chapters, sections, and paragraphs	strongly cohesive at all levels (sections, paragraphs)	extremely cohesive at all levels
<i>Use of Language I - Clarity</i>	language is unclear and inappropriate, hard to follow	style is inconsistent and unclear	style is clear, appropriate and consistent	reads easily and style is consistently appropriate	pleasant style
<i>Use of Language II - Grammar</i>	inaccurate spelling of words; grammatical errors; no explanation of acronyms; colloquial language (i.e. abbreviations of negations, verb auxiliaries)	few spelling errors, lots of grammatical mistakes (wrong agreement of subject and verb tense; wrong use of verb tenses); inconsistencies in the explanations of acronyms and colloquial forms (e.g. abbreviations)	no spelling errors; some grammatical errors; acronyms are properly introduced and explained; presence of some abbreviated forms for auxiliaries and negations	no spelling errors; minor grammatical errors; acronyms are properly introduced and explained; formal language	grammar and spelling are perfect; acronyms are properly introduced and explained; formal language
<i>Tables and Figures</i>	tables and figures unclear or missing	tables and figures not completely clear	clear and complete tables and figures (including clear captions)	very clear and comprehensive tables and figures	exceptionally clear and fully comprehensive tables and figures
<i>References</i>	Reference section is lacking	Reference section is incomplete (they are missing information, e.g. one author, the name of the journal or of the conference, the page numbers); there are missing references in the body of the document (works are reported in the reference section, but not mentioned in the body of the document when appropriate)	Reference section is complete; there are missing references in the body of the document (works are reported in the reference section, but not mentioned in the body of the document when appropriate)	Reference section is complete; no missing references in the body of the document	Reference section is complete, and works are properly cited and discussed in the body of the document