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| Criteria  (weight) | 5 Exemplary | 3 Satisfactory | 1  Needs Improv. | Score (Weighted) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Abstract (x1) | Concise summary of the paper with details and precise results in a single paragraph | Summarizes the paper, but missing parts. | Vague |  |
| Intro /Problem Statement (x1) | Document explicitly answers 3 questions in detail (several paragraphs): Why is the problem interesting? Why is it challenging? Why is the proposed solution interesting? Includes image | Answers the 3 questions, but with less detail. Or image missing. | Document briefly introduces the  problem without addressing the questions. |  |
| Extension (x2) | Performed an extensions; anticipated effects, described process, gave resultsand analyzed them. | Missing some details, like interpretation of results | Did not perform an extension. |  |
| Feature  extraction (x4) | Document describes of feature extraction process (with an example image). Correctly calculates features on a 7x7 grid. Conversion to LST is accurate. Normalization is used to weight features equally. Another could replicate your work from the detail given. | Minor error(s) in calculations that does not appear to impact classification accuracy greatly, or details missing in report. | Error that causes substantial errors in classification, or vague description in report. |  |
| SVM  classification (x3) | Clear evidence in report of experimenting with kernel methods and parameters. Evidence (a table) that the parameters chosen for the final classification are optimal (or reasonably close). | Tried few parameters and chose best, but didn’t keep trying. For ex., accuracy using  = 3 and  = 5 higher than with  < 3, but never checked  = 4. | Chose parameters or kernel without evidence that they are better than others. |  |
| Experimental setup & results  (x3) | Includes description of experimental setup (# photos of each type in each set). Final results on both test sets shown in ROC curves. Enough details so your work could be replicated. | Missing some details. | Vague or incomplete |  |
| Discussion  (x3) | Includes intelligent evaluation of your system’s performance (success & failure images shown and each discussed), and next steps to take, given more time, both in the short- (2-3 weeks) and long-term (up to a year). | Same, but minor details missing. | Document doesn’t document clear thoughts about results and future work. |  |
| Writing mechanics (x1) | Document is free of errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation. Passive voice not abused. | Document has a small number of such errors. | Document has many such errors. |  |
| Organization (x1) | Well-organized in a clear, easy-to-read manner like a conference paper or technical report. . Writing is professional, clear and unambiguous, not unnecessarily wordy. Slang (e.g., “a lot”) not used. All figures and tables cited in text. | Fairly easy to follow. | Difficult to follow |  |
| Aesthetics (x1) | All text, images and tables nicely formatted in format of conference paper or technical report. | Minor issues | Document looks sloppy |  |

No code submitted: -100% Total score = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_%
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