Grade Criteria of Report - Computer Vision Assignment 3

Score = 0.20*Problem Description + 0.25*Implementation Description + 0.20*Application of Computer Vision Techniques + 0.25*Results & Discussion + 0.05*Structure + 0.05*Readability

Criteria	Professional (+3)	Advanced (+2)	Beginner (+1)	Unacceptable (+0)
Problem, Data Description and Related Work	The problem is clearly stated, well-motivated, and contextualized within relevant literature. The student defines a clear project focus or constraint (e.g., efficiency, accuracy, or generalization) and explains why it is relevant to gesture recognition. Demonstrates a strong conceptual understanding of the task and dataset, including its structure, challenges, and limitations. The abstract succinctly summarizes the problem, approach, and chosen focus. Evidence of independent engagement with related work beyond the course material.	The problem is clearly described and motivated at an appropriate level of detail, demonstrating a strong understanding of the problem. The chosen goal/constraint is explained clearly. The used data is understood and introduced. The data has been cleaned if necessary. The abstract gives an appropriate summary of the work and most relevant resources or related works used have been introduced and briefly described with only 1-2 errors.	The problem is described and the context for the problem is mentioned, demonstrating an adequate understanding of the problem. A constraint/goal is mentioned but not clearly motivated. The used data is introduced briefly, but this description cannot be understood by someone unfamiliar with the project. The abstract somewhat summarizes the work and some relevant resources or related works used have been introduced and briefly described although some may have errors in the description.	The problem is described with too much or too little detail for an overview and demonstrates a superficial level of understanding of the problem. No goal/constraint is given. The context and motivation are not explicitly mentioned. The data is not explained. The abstract and related work may be irrelevant or missing.
Implementation Description	The baseline and improved models are comprehensively described, with clear, reproducible implementation details and well-reasoned design choices. The rationale for all major decisions (architecture, preprocessing, training, and evaluation) is explicitly linked to the chosen project focus or constraint. The report demonstrates a deep technical understanding of the implementation process.	Both baseline and improved models are described clearly, but some details or reasoning are missing. The project focus or constraint is mentioned but not systematically connected to design decisions. Implementation demonstrates solid technical ability but lacks depth or clarity in justification.	The implementation is partially described, with incomplete explanations or unclear structure. Only one model may be properly detailed, or reasoning behind decisions is minimal. The project focus/constraint is vaguely mentioned or inconsistently applied.	The implementation is unclear, incomplete, or inconsistent with the assignment requirements. Critical components or justifications are missing.
Application of Computer Vision	The project demonstrates strong and informed use of multiple	Appropriate techniques from the course are used correctly, but	Only basic CV techniques are applied, or they are used as "black	Techniques are incorrectly applied, irrelevant to the task, or missing

techniques	computer vision techniques, with evidence of adaptation or experimentation beyond direct reuse (e.g., applying temporal modelling, transfer learning, or data augmentation thoughtfully). The chosen techniques are well justified, clearly implemented, and shown to improve the model according to the project focus.	without significant adaptation or insight. Implementation is competent but not exploratory. Justification of methods and their relation to results is somewhat limited.	boxes" with little explanation of purpose or impact. Understanding appears superficial.	altogether.
Results & Discussion	Results include comprehensive quantitative (accuracy, per-class metrics, confusion matrix) and qualitative (example predictions, visualizations, or observed failure cases) analyses. Discussion is critical, well-reasoned, and linked to the project focus or constraint, addressing both successes and limitations. The analysis shows reflection, understanding of model behaviour, and awareness of future improvements.	Results are generally clear, but the analysis is mostly descriptive rather than critical. Both quantitative and qualitative results are included, but connections to design choices or the project goal are not fully explored. Discussion of weaknesses or improvements is limited.	Only one type of evaluation (quantitative or qualitative) is included, or analysis is superficial. Discussion lacks structure, misses key observations, or does not relate results to the project goal.	Evaluation is incomplete, incorrect, or absent. No meaningful discussion or insight is provided.
Structure	The report contains suitable headings and subheadings that help the reader navigate the report easily. The report flows well, all information is placed in the correct section and logically ordered.	. The report contains suitable headings and subheadings. The report flows reasonably well, most information is placed in the correct section and logically ordered.	Some of the headings and subheadings may not be relevant to the text in the section. Information is included in the wrong sections and the placement of information is illogical.	The headings/sub-headings don't describe the contents of the section well. The structure is illogical and makes the report difficult to understand.
Readability	The report is written in formal, precise, and concise academic English with few errors. All figures, tables, pseudocode or equations improve the reader's understanding of the text. Figures, tables and pseudocode are all well laid out, clearly understandable and all text inside figures is readable.	The report is written in formal, precise, and concise academic English with minor errors. Most figures, tables, pseudocode or equations improve the reader's comprehension. Figures, tables, and pseudocode are all understandable although not all are necessary to improve the reader's understanding of the text.	The report is written in English, but the tone is overly informal or vague. Some sections are hard to read. Figures and tables are included but many are not clear or understandable. They often do not help the reader's understanding of the text.	The report is written in English, with a sufficient number of errors in grammar or tone to hinder understanding throughout. Tables and figures are absent or unreadable.