

CONFIDENTIAL



**School of Computing
Final Assessment – Supervisor
CP4101 / BT4101 / XFC4101 / CP3209 / CP4106**

Please tick the relevant button for the chosen level of achievement for each sub-criteria in the tables below.

Note:

- 1. Tick achievement level High or High +, only if you can fully justify. Please provide the justification in table 3.**
- 2. This evaluation counts 35% towards the final grade.**

Table 1: Understanding of the problem, and Technical Achievement

| | Sub-criteria | Level of Achievement | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|----|---|----|----|----|----|
| | | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Understanding and formulation of the problem (20%) | Rationale | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | | | | | | | |
| | | Incomplete report submitted; fails to provide adequate context, rationale, or purpose of thesis. | Somewhat adequate statement of context supporting rationale for proposed thesis. | Provides clear context supporting rationale for proposed thesis and motivation for work. | | | | | | |
| | Problem definition | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | | | | | | | |
| | | Problem area poorly defined; objectives vague or insufficient. | Problem area is reasonably defined; Objectives are clearly outlined; although gap exists in the main area of investigation/design. | Objectives are clearly stated; explains why the problem is meaningful, innovative and challenging. | | | | | | |
| | Literature survey and/or prior work | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | | | | | | | |
| | | Review of existing work is not evident. References used are outdated. | Adequate literature survey; however uncritical and the relevance of literature survey to the project is not made clear. | Literature is critically evaluated; limitations of previous works clearly explained. | | | | | | |
| Extension of Knowledge (10%) | Evidence of Innovative work | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | | | | | | | |
| | | Basic concepts not applied correctly; No innovative work. | Basic concepts used and some innovative work initiated, but of minimal importance. | Basic and new concepts are applied and adopted in the design; Promising innovative work initiated. | | | | | | |
| | Ability to work independently | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | | | | | | | |
| | | No evidence of independent learning. | Some demonstration of independent work. | Demonstrates strong capability to perform independent work. | | | | | | |
| Methodology, Implementation and Analysis (30%) | Methodology | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | | | | | | | |
| | | Problem not fully researched or investigated; appropriateness of research/ design or investigative method is questionable. | The research/ design method is adequate. | Disciplined, well thought out investigation/design method with justification. | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| | Implementation | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | No clear specification of the problem and inadequate or trivial implementation; Limited use of problem solving skills. | Partial in-depth specification and implementation; Some steps used in solving the problem are not supported by calculations or reasoning. | Fully developed specification and supporting implementation; Use of problem solving skills is evident. |
| | Analysis | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | No assumptions stated; No analysis of the result. | Assumptions are stated but some are not justified; Limited analysis and interpretation of results. | All relevant assumptions are stated and justified; Results are analysed and well interpreted. |

Table 2: Report, Effort & Initiative

| | Sub-criteria | Level of Achievement | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Report (20%) | Organization | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | Incomplete report submitted; Poor organization of thesis; chapters not clearly linked. | Organization is generally good, but some parts seem out of place. | Written work is well organized and easy to understand; Chapters are appropriate and well linked. | | | | | | |
| | Writing style | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | Disorganized to the extent preventing understanding; Frequent spelling and grammatical errors. | A few spelling and grammatical errors. Writing style indicates planning that makes reading easy. | Spell-checked and proofread well; Writing style indicates planning that makes reading easy. | | | | | | |
| Relevance of Content | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | |
| | Considerable amount of material are irrelevant, trivial, misplaced or not documented; References are outdated and/or inadequate. | Work presented relevant to the work performed; Documentation and referencing is just adequate | Work presented entirely relevant to the work performed; Information appropriately placed in either the main text or appendices. | | | | | | | |
| Effort & Initiative (20%) | Attitude | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | |
| | | Excuses to meet supervisor; Comes unprepared for meetings. | Meetings with supervisor are intermittent and irregular; Comes to the meetings with problems and expects quick fix. | Regular meetings with the supervisor. Generally shows initiative and self-direction; Explores and generates some questions for further inquiry. | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---|---|---|
| | Effort | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | Hardly demonstrates any effort and shows little interest/diligence in the project. | Demonstrates some responsibility for setting goals/targets and planning; Demonstrates effort when prompted but not exert more effort when difficulties arise. | Highly motivated and gives maximal effort; Demonstrates perseverance when difficulties arose or when a solution was not immediately obvious |
| | Initiative | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | No progress report on project even after requests from supervisor; Does not take responsibility for own work. | Occasionally sends progress report on the project on his own; Shows motivation for some activities; Must be reminded to stay on tasks. | Timely progress report on the project;. Shows considerable diligence and independence in tackling problems encountered. |

Table 3: Justification

If you have ticked achievement level High or High + for any of the assessed criteria above, please provide reasons to justify the assessment

Is this project worth considering for the award of “Best FYP project” NO YES (please provide justification in the table 3 above)

Does the project have good commercial potential? If so, would you recommend it to be considered for the SoC Innovation Prize?

- Strongly recommend
- Recommend
- Not recommend

CONFIDENTIAL



School of Computing
Final Assessment – Main Evaluator
CP4101 / BT4101 / XFC4101 / CP3209 / CP4106

Please tick the relevant button for the chosen level of achievement for each sub-criteria in the tables below.

Note:

- 1. Tick achievement level High or High +, only if you can fully justify. Please provide the justification in table 3.**
- 2. This evaluation counts 35 % towards the final grade.**

Table 1: Understanding of the problem, and Technical Achievement

| | Sub-criteria | Level of Achievement | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Understanding and formulation of the problem (20%) | Rationale | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | Incomplete report submitted; fails to provide adequate context, rationale, or purpose of thesis. | Somewhat adequate statement of context supporting rationale for proposed thesis. | Provides clear context supporting rationale for proposed thesis and motivation for work. | | | | | | |
| | Problem definition | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | Problem area poorly defined; objectives vague or insufficient. | Problem area is reasonably defined; Objectives are clearly outlined; although gap exists in the main area of investigation/design. | Objectives are clearly stated; explains why the problem is meaningful, innovative and challenging. | | | | | | |
| Literature survey and/or prior work | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | |
| | Review of existing work is not evident. References used are outdated. | Adequate literature survey; however uncritical and the relevance of literature survey to the project is not made clear. | Literature is critically evaluated; limitations of previous works clearly explained. | | | | | | | |
| Extension of Knowledge (10%) | Evidence of Innovative work | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | Basic concepts not applied correctly; No innovative work. | Basic concepts used and some innovative work initiated, but of minimal importance. | Basic and new concepts are applied and adopted in the design; Promising innovative work initiated. | | | | | | |
| Ability to work independently | | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | No evidence of independent learning. | Some demonstration of independent work. | Demonstrates strong capability to perform independent work. | | | | | | |
| Methodology, Implementation and Analysis (30%) | Methodology | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | Problem not fully researched or investigated; appropriateness of research/ design or investigative method is questionable. | The research/ design method is adequate. | Disciplined, well thought out investigation/design method with justification. | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| | Implementation | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | No clear specification of the problem and inadequate or trivial implementation; Limited use of problem solving skills. | Partial in-depth specification and implementation; Some steps used in solving the problem are not supported by calculations or reasoning. | Fully developed specification and supporting implementation; Use of problem solving skills is evident. |
| | Analysis | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | No assumptions stated; No analysis of the result. | Assumptions are stated but some are not justified; Limited analysis and interpretation of results. | All relevant assumptions are stated and justified; Results are analysed and well interpreted. |

Table 2: Report and Presentation

| | Sub-criteria | Level of Achievement | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|---|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +1 | +2 | +3 | +4 |
| Report (20%) | Organization | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | Incomplete report submitted; Poor organization of thesis; chapters not clearly linked. | Organization is generally good, but some parts seem out of place. | Written work is well organized and easy to understand; Chapters are appropriate and well linked. | | | | | | |
| | Writing style | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | Disorganized to the extent preventing understanding; Frequent spelling and grammatical errors. | A few spelling and grammatical errors. Writing style indicates planning that makes reading easy. | Spell-checked and proofread well; Writing style indicates planning that makes reading easy. | | | | | | |
| Relevance of Content | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | |
| | Considerable amount of material are irrelevant, trivial, misplaced or not documented; References are outdated and/or inadequate. | Work presented relevant to the work performed; Documentation and referencing is just adequate | Work presented entirely relevant to the work performed; Information appropriately placed in either the main text or appendices. | | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Presentation (20%) | Presentation and slides | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | Presentation was incomprehensible; Poorly prepared slides. | Presentation was reasonable and slides were well prepared. Presented with confidence. | Presentation was excellent; Slides were well prepared. Confident and relaxed throughout the presentation. |
| | Q & A | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
| | | Unable to explain what is written on the slides; Failed to answer most of the questions inspite of prompting. | Explanation was sometimes out of context; Made good effort to answer questions, although not all of them were acceptable. | Answered questions to satisfaction and demonstrate good grasp of the project. |

Table 3: Justification

If you have ticked achievement level High or High + for any of the assessed criteria above, please provide reasons to justify the assessment

Is this project worth considering for the award of “Best FYP project” **NO** **YES** *(please provide justification in the table 3 above)*

Does the project have good commercial potential? If so, would you recommend it to be considered for the SoC Innovation Prize?

- Strongly recommend
- Recommend
- Not recommend