Semester Project Rubric
CS584: Deep Learning
Spring 2020

Each entry in this rubric is evaluated on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is fair and 10 is excellent, so higher numbers are better.

1. The presentation clearly describes and motivates the problem addressed by the project.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2. The presentation explicitly explains why a deep learning approach is appropriate for this problem.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

3. The presentation clearly describes the goal and outcome of the project and explicitly distinguishes the presenters’ work from previous work.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

4. The presentation shares the successes, failures, and other takeaways from the project, including unexpected outcomes and any societal concerns of deep learning for this problem.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

5. The presentation includes figures, tables, and/or other materials to communicate information effectively. All figures, tables, and other materials in the presentation are legible and were made by the presenters.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6. The presentation is polished with (almost) no typos or other aesthetic issues.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

7. The presentation is no longer than 3 minutes, and the presenters use their limited time effectively.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

8. The work described in the presentation is appropriate for the number of students on the project.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

9. The paper has a title, author list, and abstract; introduction, methods, results, and discussion sections; and references.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
10. The paper clearly describes and motivates the problem addressed by the project.

11. The paper explicitly explains why a deep learning approach is appropriate for this problem.

12. The paper clearly describes the goal and outcome of the project and explicitly distinguishes the authors’ work from previous work.

13. The paper cites previous and related work as appropriate.

14. The paper clearly and rigorously describes the authors’ methods.

15. The paper describes working methods that were used actually used in the project even if the originally intended methodology was unsuccessful.

16. The paper includes adequate information to reproduce the authors’ analysis.

17. The paper includes code for the authors’ methods with their submission or as a public repository.

18. The paper includes mathematical notation as appropriate.

19. The paper uses appropriate evaluation metrics to evaluate the authors’ approach and explains why those metrics are appropriate.

20. The paper describes results for the methods that were actually used in the project even if the originally intended methodology was unsuccessful.

21. The paper compares against existing approaches or baseline models as appropriate.
22. The paper draws appropriate conclusions from its results and describes future work that others may consider undertaking.

23. The paper may share the successes, failures, and other takeaways from the project as well as unexpected outcomes, but it presents a clear narrative for the reader.

24. The paper explores any societal concerns of deep learning for this problem.

25. The paper includes figures, tables, and/or other materials to communicate information effectively. All figures, tables, and other materials in the paper are legible and were made by the presenters.

26. The paper is polished with (almost) no typos or other aesthetic issues.

27. The paper uses IEEE’s LATEX conference template:

28. The paper is between 4 pages and 4.5 pages, including the title, authors, abstract, figures, and tables but excluding the references.

29. The work described in the paper is appropriate for the number of students on the project.

30. The students shared their slides, paper, and any related materials with the instructor before Tuesday, April 28, 2020 at 9:00am ET using the submission form on the course webpage (or by email if you have problems with the submission webpage). Late submissions will not be accepted.