

Final Project Peer Assessment

Grading This peer assessment is worth 5% of the final project grade. You will receive full credit if you write sufficiently detailed comments and justifications for your assessment. See Canvas for the due date.

Assignment You will assess **two** other groups' final project reports according to four factors: scope, implementation, results/analysis, and clarity/writing. For each factor, **select an option from the scale described below and write 1-4 sentences justifying your assessment of that factor.** You may have a lot to say if you find specific things to comment on; if the project is generally well done and results are unsurprising, you may find less to comment on.

You are expected to primarily look at the PDF when making your determination, as opposed to the source code. However, you can look at attached code or output if you'd like to.

You are only assigning grades of these factors on this Poor/Fair/Good/Excellent scale; you do not need to worry about assigning a final numerical grade of any sort. **Final grades will be decided by the course staff, and peer assessments will be only one factor considered.**

Submission You will upload your peer assessment **in two places.** First, you will upload it using the Canvas peer assessment tool attached to the final project. Second, there is a separate Canvas assignment where you will upload your assessment, either as raw text or a PDF, so we can assign a grade to it.

Factors

These factors and descriptions are reproduced from the original assignment PDF. Descriptions of what Poor/Fair/Good/Excellent means are meant to provide guidance about how to assign these ratings, but these are still fundamentally subjective—use your best judgment, taking into account the nature of the course (a masters-level course), the amount of time given for the project, and extenuating circumstances of the past semester.

Scope Is the idea of sufficient depth for a course project? Concretely, we expect something along one of the three axes above and a reasonable effort to execute it. While it does not have to work wonderfully, there should be something implemented beyond the base system and some analysis of that.

- Poor: Very little accomplished
- Fair: Scope is very limited, not enough work completed
- Good: Scope meets expectations: an idea is proposed, implemented, and evaluated, possibly with some bumps along the way
- Excellent: Very thorough project, with implementation that goes above and beyond expectations

Implementation Is the implementation described reasonable? Is the idea itself technically sound, or are there errors in the approach? Typically points are only deducted here if there are clear issues evident from the report. If the idea itself is sound and probably implemented correctly, the implementation should not be penalized.

- Poor: Implementation is fundamentally incomplete

- Fair: Some conceptual issues with the implementation of the idea
- Good: Possibly minor issues, but basically good (most submissions)
- Excellent: Very strong implementation (something ambitious that seems to be working correctly, for example)

Results/Analysis How well done is the evaluation? There should be a few parts: key results (comparison of the best model to a baseline), ablations (studying the contribution of each component of the approach), and additional quantitative or qualitative analysis of examples. Note that this is not assessed entirely on the basis of empirical results. A method that works poorly but which is analyzed and evaluated well may do better than a method that works okay but works great. However, absolute quality of results should be considered, and the highest grades are only awarded in cases of very strong results.

- Poor: Essentially incomplete results, not much is stated or made clear
- Fair: Poor results and insufficient analysis to justify what is observed
- Good: Mediocre to good results, but a reasonably complete picture of the results is given with analysis to explain the behavior
- Excellent: Strong results and/or very compelling analysis

Clarity/Writing The paper should clearly convey a core idea/hypothesis, describe how it was tested or what was built, and situated with respect to any related work that may have been referenced. In the abstract and introduction: were the motivation, methodology, and results summarized appropriately? Method: is the presentation of the methodology clear? Is it clear what was done? Results: are the results clearly presented in such a way that the work is understandable, whether it works well or not?

- Poor: Incomplete or very hard to understand
- Fair: Serious issues with the presentation affect the understanding of the methodology; it was hard to determine what was done
- Good: Mostly well written, but some aspects were hard to understand or the presentation is poorly structured
- Excellent: Very well written

Miscellaneous You should **NOT** consider the following factors:

- Whether the report conforms to a very specific template; basically anything legible is fine. If it's sloppy, is the sloppiness mostly aesthetic or does it actually detract from clarity?
- Whether the project author(s) found similar or different results as you did. Try to critically assess what they're presenting, but just because the results might disagree with yours doesn't mean they did something wrong.