# Milestone 3: Model Draft

**DUE: Week 9 (Sunday, March 9th at 11:59 PM)**

Submit your **Python code** as well as a **team-written review of your original project proposal** as a pdf document:

For your code submission, show that:
- Code for PyTorch model is able to perform a forward pass.

- A training loop is implemented, along with an accuracy test.

- Model architecture code matches the proposal document, or has explanations for differences commented in the code.

- NOTE: While we check if you are able to calculate the test accuracy of your model, we are not grading based on how high the resulting accuracy is at this Milestone.

For your Project Proposal Review:
- Document any changes from your submitted proposal and why you made these changes.

- For each section of the original proposal, write a paragraph reviewing that section, even if you were correct in your initial assumptions.

  - **Each section must have a corresponding paragraph!**

- Based on the rudimentary accuracy score given by your current model, re-evaluate what an achievable, yet challenging goal accuracy should be for your fully refined and improved model you will submit in the next Milestone.

- Additionally, address what improvements to your model you plan on making in the upcoming final week of the project.

  - Justify why you are making changes, how you predict they will affect the model, and the process for evaluating the changes.

Rubric on next page:

| Model Draft 35pts | Model is able to perform a forward pass consistently throughout the training loop. The training loop functions and updates the models parameters through multiple epochs.<br><br>A testing phase is also implemented. All works well. No good model accuracy necessary. | Missing a testing phase that gives some kind of output. Maybe the model doesn't update its parameters during training. Not all of the 50pts box has been fully implemented. | Large error making the model unable to complete a forward pass. Demonstrated misunderstanding of the model's purpose. Or is missing the training loop altogether. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Project Proposal Review 15pts | All sections of the Project Proposal are addressed. All commentary is explained and justified, both for changes made and for correct initial assumptions left unchanged.<br><br>New proposed accuracy goals (or old accuracy if not changed) are challenging yet achievable with explanation as to why they make sense given the current accuracy.<br><br>Improvement processes planned for the model are reasonable and thoroughly explained. | Some of the sections have unsatisfactory explanations with poor or lacking justifications.<br><br>New (or kept) proposed accuracy is not justified thoroughly.<br><br>Improvement processes are vague, unachievable, unexplained, or trivial to implement (lacking steps). | Sections are missing entirely, missing or very unclear on proposed changes to accuracy or model improvements. |