Presentation Evaluations

Please take a moment to evaluate the presentations:

Presentation	Grade (A,B,C,D,F)	Rank Order (1 to 4)
1. **J. Burnham, J. Hardy, and K. Meadors** "Comparison of Several Edge Detection Algorithms"	——	——
2. **A. Le, J. Ngan, J. Shaffer** "Classification of Signal Data Using Decision Trees"	——	——
3. **S.B. Balakrishnama and R.M. Brown, Jr.** "Scenic Beauty Estimation Using Linear Discriminant Analysis"	——	——
4. **V. Juvvigunta, B. Nakshatrala and N. Kompella** "Reconstruction of Signals from Irregularly Sampled Data"	——	——
	——	——
	——	——
	——	——

Date: Wed, 5 Nov 1997 15:23:42 -0600
From: Joe Picone - The Terminal Man <picone@isip.msstate.edu>
To: steven.given@adtran.com, brent.zitting@adtran.com, law1@ece.msstate.edu,
Jimmy.H.Beard@bridge.bst.bls.com
Cc: ece_4773
Subject: ECE 4773/6773 grading
Reply-to: picone@isip.msstate.edu

At the URL: http://isip.msstate.edu/publications/courses/ece_4773/conference/1997, click on peer review.
This page provides a summary of the panel members and your assignment.

As a committee, you will be asked to provide the following
for each presentation and each demo:

 - a single letter grade (hopefully, a consensus)
 - a rank ordering of the teams (best first)
 - a couple of sentences describing the major strength of the project
 - a couple of sentences describing the major weakness of the project

For the presentations, you should look for the extent to which the
project achieved the milestones described in the proposal, how
impressive the presentation was, organization, clarity, etc.

To simplify this, just ask yourself if you saw this presentation
at ICASSP, you would think:

 MS State has a great MS DSP programLetter grade: A
 the work was good but preliminaryLetter grade: B
 the project was ok, but poorly presentedLetter grade: C
 this must be really embarrassing forLetter grade: oops
      the speaker

Key danger signs are a lack of results on real data, no solid
performance results, etc.

For the demos, it is important that the system actually work,
that the presentation of the technology be convincing, and
that the system performs some processing of real data on the spot.

Again, think of what happens when you visit a booth at a conference,
and a vendor does a demo. Do you:

 buy the productLetter grade: A
 take notes on how to make your own demo betterLetter grade: B
 find a bug or problem in the first two minutesLetter grade: C
 get angry at the vendor for wasting your timeLetter grade: oops
   (this has happened to me on the demos)

Thanks.

-Joe