Components	Weight	Sophisticated (3)	Competent (2)	Not Yet Competent (1)
Introduction	20%	The goal of the project is clearly stated <b>and</b> the reader can immediately grasp not only the importance of the proposed work, but also why the problem being addressed is challenging <b>and</b> there is a concise summary of the work completed	The goal is not clearly stated <b>or</b> the importance of the problem is unclear <b>or</b> 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
Survey	60%	For each paper reviewed, there is a concise summary of the main technical contributions, and strengths and weaknesses are identified. <b>and</b> The papers are chosen carefully, and are thematically related <b>and</b> at least 5 papers are reviewed	The technical contributions for each paper are not concisely stated; <b>or</b> 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
Writing	20%	The writing shows a clear argumentative flow and equations if any are carefully explained; <b>and</b> conclusions are well supported by evidence; <b>and</b> no spelling or grammatical errors.	The arguments are mostly correct, with a few unsupported assertions <b>and</b> the writing is poorly organized, including presence of equations that are not well explained; <b>or</b> 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