



## CS 584 Course Project Report Marking Rubrics

Total points: 100'

### ACL format and page limitation: 10'

- Good (10'): Adheres to the ACL format and the 8-page limitation.
- Unsatisfactory (5'): Uses the incorrect template, or exceeds the 8-page limitation for the main paper.

### Abstract: 10'

- Good (10'): Follows a clear structure. Contains the contents like the problem, the solution and the importance.
- Fair (7'): Follows some structure. Have some components like the problem, the solution, or the importance.
- Unsatisfactory (4'): Does not have a clear structure.

### Introduction: 10'

- Good (10'): Follows a clear structure. States the motivation, the problem, the solution, and the importance.
- Fair (7'): Has some structure but may miss some crucial parts (e.g., the motivation, the problem, the solution, and the importance). This section contains some minor problems, e.g., including too many jargons when overviewing the solution.
- Unsatisfactory (4'): Has a confusing structure. Misses many crucial parts. This section contains many problems.

### Related Works: 10'

- Good (10'): Contains at least two paragraphs, reviewing (1) other papers working on the similar problems, and (2) other papers using a similar solution to different problems. Each paragraph shows a clear logical structure and ends with a sentence stating the difference from them (i.e., specifies the "hole" in the literature).
- Fair (7'): Follows some structures. Contains some of the crucial components in a good Related Works section. There are some minor problems, for example, that the section is too long or short, or the related works section reviews too few papers and misses out many crucial relevant works.
- Unsatisfactory (4'): Follows a confusing structure, or discusses few related works.



**Method: 20'**

- Good (20'): Clearly describes the methodology, and the procedure. For each step that involves critical decisions, explains the rationale behind the decision. Equations are used, when applicable, to unambiguously describe the methods. Following the descriptions, it'd be easy to replicate the works.
- Fair (14'): The methodology contains some unclear parts. Following the descriptions, it'd be possible to replicate the works, with difficulty.
- Unsatisfactory (8'): The methodology section has many unclear parts. It'd be very hard to replicate the works.

**Data and experiment setting: 10'**

- Good (10'): Describes the data, model, experiment settings clearly. Following the descriptions, it'd be easy to replicate the finding of the paper. The coverage of the experiments can support the range of the claims made in the Introduction.
- Fair (7'): There are some unclear descriptions. Following the descriptions, it'd be possible to replicate the works, with some difficulty. Some of the settings are not reasonable and can be improved.
- Unsatisfactory (4'): The descriptions are very unclear. Many settings are not reasonable.

**Experiment result: 10'**

- Good (10'): Extensive quantitative and qualitative results are included. The presented results are accompanied with words that explain their meanings. The results support the claims made in the Introduction very well. Ablation studies are presented, when possible, to strengthen the findings. For experimental papers, there are results of both the baseline and the multiple possible solutions, with the best-performing solution the proposed one.
- Fair (7'): Some quantitative or qualitative results are missing. Several results are missing explanations. The results can in general support the claims made in the Introduction.
- Unsatisfactory (4'): Very inadequate results are presented. The experiments are unfinished. The results can't support the central claims of the paper.

**Discussion: 10'**

- Good (10'): There are insightful discussions about the strengths and the weaknesses of the designed solution for the chosen problem. Several other meaningful topics of discussions can include: what are the capabilities of models that are used when building the solution? If future people want to build a better solution, what do you recommend them to do?
- Fair (7'): There are some meaningful discussions, organized in a meaningful structure. There are some insights regarding the strengths and the weaknesses of the designed solution and the alternative solutions. There are some recommendations for future people who want to build better solutions.



- Unsatisfactory (4'): Very few discussions are present.

**Conclusion: 10'**

- Good (10'): Similar to Abstract, but the Conclusion section emphasizes the experiment results and the impacts.
- Fair (7'): The conclusion section is too long or too short.
- Unsatisfactory (4'): The conclusion section is missing.

**Other items**

- Typo, and other formatting issues: Take one mark off per occurrence.