

Components	Weight	Sophisticated (3)	Competent (2)	Not Yet Competent (1)
Introduction	20%	The goal of the project is clearly stated and the reader can immediately grasp not only the importance of the proposed work, but also why the problem being addressed is challenging and there is a concise summary of the work completed	The goal is not clearly stated or the importance of the problem is unclear or the challenges in addressing the problem are unclear	The goal is not stated and needs to be inferred from the text; project lacks motivation –neither the importance or the challenges are unclear
Related Work	10%	For each paper reviewed, there is a concise summary of the main technical contributions, and strengths and weaknesses are identified. and The papers are chosen carefully, and are thematically related	The technical contributions for each paper are not concisely stated; or either the strengths or the weaknesses are not identified; or the papers are only loosely connected	For the papers reviewed, the main technical contributions are unclear; the strengths and weaknesses are either not identified or are incorrect; or the papers chosen for review are not thematically related
Detailed Project Description	35%	There is clarity on what is being proposed: a new model, a new algorithm or a system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem is formally defined and • The proposed model, framework or system is presented in sufficient detail and • The equations are correct, carefully written and all variables are explained. and • The relationship to prior work, including extensions and improvements are clear and • Any assumptions made while pursuing the work are clearly stated 	The proposal is clear on the final deliverable, but has one or more weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem is not formally defined or • The proposed model, framework or system is presented without sufficient detail or • The equations are correct, but cursorily presented without explanation of the variables • While some assumptions are made explicit, others are left unstated. 	There is little clarity on what is being proposed: the final deliverable is unclear <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem statement is missing or is inaccurate and • The framework, algorithm or system is either sparingly explained or is incorrect and • There are errors in the equations and • The assumptions are incorrect

Components	Weight	Sophisticated (3)	Competent (2)	Not Yet Competent (1)
Preliminary Results	20%	Preliminary results from the model / framework are presented; and the results show promise.	preliminary results from the model / framework are presented and the results are weak or poor	No results are provided
Datasets	5%	Dataset to test the proposed work has been identified; the dataset is well matched to the problem, is of sufficient size and quality and will enable the group to test its model or algorithm; the authors provide a careful justification for their choice	Dataset has been identified, but lacks justification; it is unclear if the dataset is of sufficient size or quality to enable the authors to test their proposed work	Dataset is not yet identified
Evaluation	5%	Several metrics to evaluate the proposed algorithm or model are presented; each metric is well justified	A metric is proposed, but is not justified; that is, what is unclear is why the proposed metric is appropriate to evaluate the proposed work	No metric is provided
Writing	5%	The writing shows a clear argumentative flow and equations if any are carefully explained; and conclusions are well supported by evidence; and no spelling or grammatical errors.	The arguments are mostly correct, with a few unsupported assertions and the writing is poorly organized, including presence of equations that are not well explained; or some grammatical errors but no spelling errors	Writing lacks a clear argumentative flow; or conclusions or assertions are unsupported; or many spelling and grammatical errors