

# STAT/BIOST 572

## Project Instructions and Grading

### Final Written Projects

The main sections of the project should comprise  $\leq 20$  pages, without appendices. Appendices may contain longer proofs and annotated R code. You should send an electronic version of the report (including appendices) and code to Ken.

The written projects will be assessed as follows; (Max 30 points)

1. *Motivation and Background Literature:* (2 points) What is the problem being considered, why is it important? Is there a comprehensive review of methods that have been described for this problem, and in particular the progress that has been made improving methods?
2. *Methods:* (8 points) Are the methods clearly explained? Are details of the proposed method given? Does the description given relate the proposed method to previous methods?
3. *Implementation:* (12 points) Have the simulations and/or data analysis been correctly implemented? Where decisions had to be made about implementation (e.g. choice of tuning parameters) have these been adequately described and justified?
4. *Conclusions and critique:* (4 points) Are the main problems/assumptions of the method described? Where applicable, is work stimulated by the paper described?
5. *Presentation:* (4 points) Is the writing style effective? Do the tables, graphs effectively convey information of interest? Are the proofs written precisely and rigorously?

### Final Talks

The talks should be 25 minutes long, and you should expect 5 minutes of questions. Assume the audience has not seen the material previously, but is familiar with statistical methodology (up to the level of 570 and 571).

The talks will be assessed on the following three categories; (Max 30 points)

1. *Presentation:* (5 points) Was the talk clear and audible? Was the overall style effective? Were math equations, graphs and tables clear and effective? Was the pace good? Did the speaker use the time well? Was the speaker enthusiastic? Did the speaker have any distracting behavior or mannerisms?
2. *Organization:* (5 points) Was the talk well organized? Was there a good balance of introductory and more advanced material?
3. *Content:* (20 points) Was the problem addressed by the paper well motivated? Were the methods clearly explained? Was the information accurate? Did the speaker convey a deep understanding of the method?