***1 - Project specification, motivation and aims (mark 10%)***

*• 8 to 10: An outstanding project report will motivate the project in such a way that the reader understands the importance of the project and the approach that will be taken. The aims, objectives and scope of the project should be clear, as well as how success should be judged. Overall, the motivation, context and aims should be written at a level of quality such that they could be published at a good conference or journal in the specific field of the project.  
• 7 to 7.9: A very good report should only have minor weaknesses, compared to an outstanding report (as described in the previous paragraph). For example, the motivation might be missing, or the aims might be vaguely defined. Overall, the content of these sections of the report should be of a quality that they could be published at a good workshop in the specific field of the project.  
• 6 to 6.9: A report in this range might have several weaknesses but, overall, still conveys a clear motivation and aims for the project.  
• 4 to 5.9: A report in this range contains motivation and aims that have weaknesses but are, in general, still understandable. The purpose of the project and a some aims are reasonably clear.  
• 2.5 to 3.9: A report in this range lacks structure and clarity, compared to a work in the previous category. Still, there is some motivation and some aims are identified.  
• 0 to 2.4: A report in this range has severe weaknesses in motivation and/or aims (e.g., it fails to motivate and explain the work at all, or does not articulate any aims/objectives).*

***2 - Design, methods and implementation (mark 25%)***

*• 8 to 10: The report describes in a lot of details all the important aspects of the project such as experimental design, methods and implementation. At this mark range, the details around the design, methods and implementation  should be enough for a scientist in the area to accurately reproduce the presented the work.  All design choices are properly justified and backed up by supporting evidences. All the success criteria are described and justified. The resources utilised in the project are also very well described.  
• 7 to 7.9: The report provides a great level of details to all important aspects of the project such as experimental design, methods and implementation. All design choices are properly justified  and backed up by supporting evidences. All the success criteria are described and justified. The resources utilised in the project are also very well described.  
• 6 to 6.9: The report provides a reasonable amount of details  to all the important aspects of the project such as experimental design, methods and implementation details with relevant justification for the choices, including the success criteria. The resources utilised in the project are properly described.  
• 4 to 5.9: The report describes with some level of details the most important aspects of the project design, methods and implementation with relevant justification for the choices. The resources are reasonably described. Some aspects of the success criteria were presented.  
• 2.5 to 3.9: The report contains no (or very limited) details regarding more than one of the following elements: the key project design choices, its methods and/or implementations,  the resources utilised in the project (e.g., data, models, frameworks, tools), justification for the design or development choices and measures of success.  
• 0 to 2.4: The report presents neither the project design choices - including its methods or implementations - nor the success criteria.*

Using 100hertz for all data recorded but when handling the data halving it so that the model can run smoothly

Looking at different methods to create models for machine learning. One Idea is the use of polynomial regression on a single repetition of an exercise that I can then apply to the rest of the data.

***3 - Project results, evaluation and testing (mark 25%)***

*• 8 to 10: An outstanding report should present comprehensive results/outcomes with full and appropriate analysis and supporting evidence/evaluation/testing. Results are presented with appropriate context (e.g. comparison experiments, baselines, error bounds, user studies), which can clearly and fully justify the technical advantages of the selected solutions. Outcomes are convincing, comprehensive, and represent an excellent piece of work that shows an identifiable problem-solving strategy and substantial originality.  
• 7 to 7.9: A good report should present enough results with appropriate and sufficient analysis. Results are presented with some context for their interpretation, which can justify the projects conclusions. Outcomes are reasonably convincing and may show originality.  
• 6 to 6.9: A report in this range presents an adequate amount of results with appropriate analysis, but is not comprehensive and its quality does not reach the highest standards. It should contain appropriate figures and tables, with suitable context (e.g. error bars). Outputs are of good quality, but do not show any novel results or originality.  
• 4 to 5.9: A report in this range presents some results/outputs with some basic analysis. It does not contain or contains very few contextual/comparative metrics, e.g. only simple baseline methods, or a lack of appropriate statistics. Outputs are mediocre and do not fully address the research question. The experimental results are shown by using a few tables, figures and charts, etc. but these are not well constructed.  
• 2.5 to 3.9: Some experimental results are included in the report and very simple analysis is presented, but there are multiple weaknesses or missing elements.  
• 0 to 2.4: No results/outputs, or very rudimentary results/outputs, with major weaknesses and omissions. No analysis or very limited analysis.*

***4 - Project discussion and conclusion (mark 15%)***

*• 8 to 10: An outstanding report will have a coherent discussion of the results including a critical reflection and potential future directions. This report does not contain any flaws and is as strong as one would expect from a publication in a good conference or journal.*

*• 7 to 7.9: A very good project report report will have a mostly coherent discussion of the results including a critical reflection on the work. It only contains minor flaws or missing pieces that do not cast any doubts on the quality of the presented results.   
• 6 to 6.9: A good project report will have a compelling discussion of the results including convincing critical reflection on the work. The reflection will include all major aspects of the project.  
• 4 to 5.9: The report contains a mostly coherent discussion and critical reflection. While the discussion and reflection might miss aspects of the work, the overall message should come across and it should not contain any major flaws or inconsistencies.  
• 2.5 to 3.9: The report might contain a brief discussion but it contains significant flaws.  
• 0 to 2.4: The reports lacks any discussions nor reflections or they are incoherent and contain major flaws.*

***5 - Style and Presentation (mark 10%)***

*• 8 to 10: An outstanding project report will follow strictly the layout and editorial guidelines, including a complete and accurate bibliography. The structure of the report follows a clear narrative flow and contains all appropriate sections with no unnecessary content. All figures, tables and other items are very well presented. The writing style is concise and clear and there are no (or very minor) spelling and grammar mistakes. Overall, the style and presentation should be of such a quality that it could be published in a good conference of journal.  
• 7 to 7.9: A very good project report will only have minor weaknesses compared to the definition for the previous range. There may be some minor errors in following the layout and editorial guidelines, or in the bibliography. The writing style is mostly concise and clear but there may be occasional mistakes in the use of the English language and grammar that do not affect the meaning. There may be occasional weaknesses in minor aspects of figures and tables. The structure is clear and appropriate. Overall, the style and presentation should be of such a quality that it could be published in a good workshop.  
• 6 to 6.9: A good project report is well written and presented, but has some weaknesses that prevent it meeting the quality required for a very good project report in one or two areas. For example, it might have incomplete bibliographic references, inconsistent spelling/grammar, or some poorly presented figures/tables. The structure is clear and appropriate. The report overall does not contain any major issues. Project reports that exceed the page range can not achieve a mark beyond this range.  
• 4 to 5.9: A satisfactory project report will mostly follow the layout and style guides but might have medium or severe issues in several aspects (e.g., an incomplete bibliography, poor writing, bad structure, inaccurate figures/tables).  
• 2.5 to 3.9: A project report in this range will violate the given style guides severely in at lest one aspect (e.g., using the layout guidelines, missing out an important section, having a major structural issue).  
• 0 to 2.4: A project report in this marking range makes little attempt to follow the basic layout or style guidelines, omits several sections or has no recognisable structure, or has multiple other major weaknesses.*