

APPM 4490/5490 Theoretical Machine Learning: Rubric for project. Spring 2022, Prof. Stephen Becker

Group Members:

| High-level Component | Component | Percent of grade | High standard | Medium standard | Low standard | Grade |
|---|--|------------------|---|---|---|-------|
| Valid/interesting project (25%), and point of project is clear | Clear non-trivial problem is formulated | 10% | Problem is of suitable difficulty, and clearly defined | Problem a bit too easy or too hard, or ill-defined | Problem is very easy or very much too hard, and vaguely defined | |
| | Problem is well-motivated | 10% | Problem is interesting, and the reasons why are clearly explained | Problem is interesting but this is not explained, or explanations are lacking | Problem is not interesting, or no explanation at all | |
| | Alternatives approaches are considered | 5% | Several approaches are considered, and there is support behind the approach taken. Alternative approaches need not be exhaustively listed, but a few categories of alternative approaches should be described | A few but not enough alternatives are discussed, or, it is not clear why your approach was chosen | No discussion of alternatives | |
| Relate the project to a concept from class (25%). Your project must include a paragraph describing how it involves concepts learned in class. | Problem involves significant amount of theory or computing | 15% | Problem requires synthesis of material learned in class, though not necessarily at the level of a professional journal paper | Problem requires a bit of material learned in class, but not that much | Problem is trivial or off-topic (you can always ask the instructor before hand if you are worried it is too off-topic) | |
| | Related to concept learned in class | 10% | Clear paragraph on relation to concept | Some relationship to concept from class but not made clear | Doesn't related to a concept from class | |
| Insightful discussion (25%). You should discuss/analyze your results, and/or validate a conclusion. For a paper review, you should discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the paper. For a project that involves generating your own results, the quality of the actual work is included in this category. | Final result achieved, or obstacles discussed | 15% | Problem is solved, or it is made clear why it was infeasible to solve it | Problem is partly solved, but no discussion of why it wasn't fully solved | Problem not solved at all, and no discussion of what the fundamental difficulty was | |
| | Generates valid conclusions | 10% | Report or presentation makes concluding remarks that are useful for the reader/listener | No interesting final comments, other than a summary of work completed. No analysis | No conclusion | |
| Professional communication (25%) of the written document and the oral presentation (and the slides). Well-organized and precise communication, grammatically correct writing, nicely format- ted documents and figures. Figures should be labeled appropriately. | Communication (report and possibly presentation) | 25% | Well-organized and clear, logic easy to follow. Words are precise, jargon is appropriate. Figures presented as necessary. Grammatically correct | Follows high standard most of the time | Lacks organization; reader/listener has to make considerable effort to understand flow of ideas. Helpful figures may be missing. Grammar/spelling bad enough to make it difficult for the reader to interpret in places | |
| TOTAL | | 100% | | | sub-total | |
| ADJUSTMENTS | Not attending class when during presentation days: -10%. Not ready to present when it's your turn: -10% | | | | total | |