

	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Outstanding
Articulation of problem & motivation	Not well-defined, not understandable, no domain/foundation, narrow focus or poor delivery	Good foundation, definition, or applicable But, perhaps the focus is wide, poor justification, poor delivery plans	Well defined focus, focused, justified, applicable	Well-defined, clear, easy to understand Applicable, well-motivated Well-scoped
Treatment of prior work (scope)	Doesn't talk about the field Without mentioning any similar work	"Laundry list" of related/prior work – doesn't do much synthesis	Articulates benefits and drawbacks from previous work as it relates to current work	Categorizing and synthesizing of previous work, and showing the area that we're working in, pointing out how the specific idea is novel within the context of that prior work (holes in prior work) – similarities, strengths weaknesses of prior work
Approach (appropriateness) / Solution / Timetable	Approach is irrelevant, and does not address the problem, or Timetable is unrealistic, does not identified appropriate phases and times or no timetable	Approach addresses problem, but has weaknesses Other approaches may address problem better but authors do not address them – don't understand what the weaknesses of your own approach are Timetable is missing phases and has some unreasonable times	Approach addresses problem completely, and supports choice of solution Timetable addresses all phases and makes reasonable time estimates	Approach is very novel and builds on new ideas [rationale/purposeful] Timetable is complete and very detailed Can manage risk (feasibility)
Evaluation Method / Metric (rationale)	Proposed evaluation method is inappropriate or inadequately justified	Evaluation method/metric does not adequately address the problem or only a superficial rationale presented – can be one that has been used by others	Evaluation method/metric "makes sense" given the problem, and is sufficiently supported/rationalized	Evaluation method/metric follows immediately given the problem articulation, and rationale for the evaluation is spelled out extremely clearly
Novelty / value of proposed research	Cannot clearly describe the benefits or usefulness (no novelty – no change) Very similar to prior work	Clearly describes the benefits and no change previous work	Clearly define the benefits & huge improvement from previous work	An idea that has disruptive potential in the domain (good results and easily scalable to the real world)
Structure / Style	Inappropriate structure or academic writing style	Some inconsistencies in the story, or some "unstandard" structure	"Story" is consistent throughout, and follows a standard structure	Excellent flow, following a standard structure