# Sunset Detector, Part 2 Rubric Name(s):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

CSSE 463—Image Recognition

| Criteria  (weight) | 5 Exemplary | 3 Satisfactory | 1  Needs Improv. | Score (Weighted) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Abstract (x1) | Concise summary of the paper with details (and CNN) and precise results in a single paragraph | Summarizes the paper, but missing parts or little detail. | Vague |  |
| Introduction (x1) | Document grabs attention and explicitly answers in detail (several paragraphs): Why interesting? Why challenging? Why is the proposed solution (including CNN) interesting? Places problem in larger context. Sets the scope (inputs and expected outputs). Has >= 1image. | Answers the 3 questions, but with less detail. | Document briefly introduces the  problem without addressing the questions. |  |
| Feature  extract (x4) | LST, Grid features, could replicate your work from the detail given. | Minor error(s) in calculations | Big error or vague |  |
| SVM  classif (x3) | Clear evidence of hyper-parameter tuning. Standardization. | Evidence of some tuning. | No tuning |  |
| Experimental setup & results  (x4) | Includes description of experimental setup. Final results on the test set shown in an ROC curve. Enough details so your work could be replicated. | Missing some details. Like ROC curve missing. | Vague or incomplete |  |
| Discussion  (x4) | Includes simplifying asns, intelligent evaluation of your system’s performance (success & failure images shown and each discussed both for SVM and one of the CNN methods), 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 like if little future work. | Document doesn’t document clear thoughts about results and future work. |  |
| Writing mech. and proofing (x1) | Document is free of typos and errors in writing mechanics | Document has a small number of such errors. | Document has many such errors. |  |
| Professional writing style (x1) | See part 1. (Clear, concise, formal, no 2nd-person or slang.) |  | Difficult to follow or very informal. |  |
| Aesthetics and organization (x1) | Looks nice (e.g., fig, tables, eqns numbered, sized, cited. No orphan headers. | Minor issues | Document looks sloppy |  |
| CNN method 1 (x8) | Process of using a pre-trained CNN clearly documented. Includes clear evidence of using the validation set to tune SVM or CNN hyper-parameters. Includes accuracy and an ROC curve on the test set. |  |  |  |
| CNN method 2 (x8) | Same as previous, but using a pre-trained net in a second way or training a new network from scratch. Compared to CNN method 1. |  |  |  |
| Pre-trained model varied (x4) | For any pre-trained model, process and results shown for a second pre-trained model and compared to the first model. |  |  |  |

If no code submitted, 0% Total score = \_\_\_\_\_\_\_%  
Comments: