

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 A or A+, 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   |   |  |  |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|----|----|---|----|----|---|----|
|   |  | F  | D   | D+   | C  | C+ | B- | B | B+ | A- | A | A+ |
| <b>Understanding and formulation of the problem (20%)</b> | <b>Rationale</b>   | ●  | ●   | ●  | ●  | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  |
|   |  | Report not submitted or is incomplete.   | 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.           |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |
|   | <b>Problem definition</b>                                    | ●  | ●   | ●  | ●  | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  |
|   |  | Problem is not defined or irrelevant to the project.   | 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. |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |
| <b>Literature survey and/or prior work</b>                | ●  | ●  | ●   | ●  | ●  | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  | ●  | ● |    |
|   | Review of existing work is missing or completely irrelevant. | Amount of review of existing work is inadequate. References are outdated, lack currency, or inappropriate.             | 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.   |  |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |
| <b>Extension of Knowledge (10%)</b>                       | <b>Evidence of Innovative work</b>                           | ●  | ●   | ●  | ●  | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  | ●  | ● |    |
|   |  | Basic concepts not applied correctly; Completely no innovative work done.  | Only basic concepts used or work is directly taken as-is from current existing works.   | 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. |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |
| <b>Ability to work independently</b>                      | ●  | ●  | ●   | ●  | ●  | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  | ●  | ● |    |
|   | Unable to work even when guided by the supervisor.           | Independent work done only after extensive guidance from supervisor.   | Some demonstration of independent work.   | Demonstrates strong capability to perform independent work.  |  |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |
| <b>Methodology, Implementation and Analysis (30%)</b>     | <b>Methodology</b>   | ●  | ●   | ●  | ●  | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  | ●  | ● |    |
|   |  | Problem is not researched at all. Design or method used is incompletely inappropriate.                                 | 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.                      |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |
| <b>Implementation</b>                                     | ●  | ●  | ●   | ●  | ●  | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  | ●  | ● |    |
|   | Incomplete 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.                             |  |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |

|  |                 |   |   |  |   |
|--|-----------------|---|---|--|---|
|  |                 | ● ●   | ● ● ●   | ● ● ●  | ● ● ●   |
|  | <b>Analysis</b> | No assumptions stated; No analysis of the result. | Assumptions stated are all unjustified. Analysis and interpretation of results are largely incorrect. | 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   |  |   |   |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                                      |                             | F  | D  | D+  | C   | C+    | B-    | B     | B+    | A-    | A     |
| <b>Report (20%)</b>                  | <b>Organization</b>         | ● ●  | ● ● ●  | ● ● ●   | ● ● ●   | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
|                                      |                             | Report is missing, or complete lack of 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.  |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|                                      | <b>Writing style</b>        | ● ●  | ● ● ●  | ● ● ●   | ● ● ●   | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
|                                      |                             | Report is missing or incoherent.                                     | 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.   |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|                                      | <b>Relevance of Content</b> | ● ●  | ● ● ●  | ● ● ●   | ● ● ●   | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |       |
|                                      |                             | Report is missing, content found to be completely irrelevant.        | 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.                 |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| <b>Effort &amp; Initiative (20%)</b> | <b>Attitude</b>             | ● ●  | ● ● ●  | ● ● ●   | ● ● ●   | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |       |
|                                      |                             | Lack of any interaction with the supervisor.                         | 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. |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|                                      | <b>Effort</b>               | ● ●  | ● ● ●  | ● ● ●   | ● ● ●   | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |       |
|                                      |                             | No effort shown.   | 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.    |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|                                      | <b>Initiative</b>           | ● ●  | ● ● ●  | ● ● ●   | ● ● ●   | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |       |
|                                      |                             | Complete lack of initiative work. Supervisor is needed to intervene. | 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 A or A+ for any of the assessed criteria above, please provide reasons to justify the assessment**

Q1 Is this project worth considering for award, such as “Outstanding Undergraduate Researcher Prize (OURP)”, “Best FYP/UROP/Computing Project”, SoC Innovation Prize, etc.? *(please provide justification in the table 3 above)*

NO  YES

Q2. Does the project have good commercial potential?

- Strong potential
- Good potential
- No potential / not intended for commercial purposes

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 A or A+, 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   |   |  |  |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|----|----|---|----|----|---|----|
|   |  | F  | D   | D+   | C  | C+ | B- | B | B+ | A- | A | A+ |
| <b>Understanding and formulation of the problem (20%)</b> | <b>Rationale</b>   | ●  | ●   | ●  | ●  | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  |
|   |  | Report not submitted or is incomplete.   | 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.           |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |
|   | <b>Problem definition</b>                                    | ●  | ●   | ●  | ●  | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  |
|   |  | Problem is not defined or irrelevant to the project.   | 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. |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |
| <b>Literature survey and/or prior work</b>                | ●  | ●  | ●   | ●  | ●  | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  | ●  | ● |    |
|   | Review of existing work is missing or completely irrelevant. | Amount of review of existing work is inadequate. References are outdated, lack currency, or inappropriate.             | 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.   |  |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |
| <b>Extension of Knowledge (10%)</b>                       | <b>Evidence of Innovative work</b>                           | ●  | ●   | ●  | ●  | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  | ●  | ● |    |
|   |  | Basic concepts not applied correctly; Completely no innovative work done.  | Only basic concepts used or work is directly taken as-is from current existing works.   | 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. |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |
| <b>Ability to work independently</b>                      | ●  | ●  | ●   | ●  | ●  | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  | ●  | ● |    |
|   | Unable to work even when guided by the supervisor.           | Independent work done only after extensive guidance from supervisor.   | Some demonstration of independent work.   | Demonstrates strong capability to perform independent work.  |  |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |
| <b>Methodology, Implementation and Analysis (30%)</b>     | <b>Methodology</b>   | ●  | ●   | ●  | ●  | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  | ●  | ● |    |
|   |  | Problem is not researched at all. Design or method used is incompletely inappropriate.                                 | 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.                      |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |
| <b>Implementation</b>                                     | ●  | ●  | ●   | ●  | ●  | ●  | ●  | ● | ●  | ●  | ● |    |
|   | Incomplete 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.                             |  |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |

|  |                 |   |   |  |   |
|--|-----------------|---|---|--|---|
|  |                 | ● ●   | ● ● ●   | ● ● ●  | ● ● ●   |
|  | <b>Analysis</b> | No assumptions stated; No analysis of the result. | Assumptions stated are all unjustified. Analysis and interpretation of results are largely incorrect. | 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   |  |   |   |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                             |                                | F  | D  | D+  | C   | C+    | B-    | B     | B+    | A-    | A     |
| <b>Report (20%)</b>         | <b>Organization</b>            | ● ●  | ● ● ●  | ● ● ●   | ● ● ●   | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
|                             |                                | Report is missing, or complete lack of 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.                                |       |       |       |       |       |       |
|                             | <b>Writing style</b>           | ● ●  | ● ● ●  | ● ● ●   | ● ● ●   | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |
|                             |                                | Report is missing or incoherent.   | 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.                                     |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| <b>Relevance of Content</b> |                                | ● ●  | ● ● ●  | ● ● ●   | ● ● ●   | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |       |
|                             |                                | Report is missing, content found to be completely irrelevant.                                | 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. |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| <b>Presentation (20%)</b>   | <b>Presentation and slides</b> | ● ●  | ● ● ●  | ● ● ●   | ● ● ●   | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |       |
|                             |                                | Absent from presentation, or presentation was incomprehensible, lacking any prepared slides. | Presentation was poor and unorganized. Slides were poorly prepared, reading off text, content not well presented and difficult to understand.    | Presentation was reasonable and slides were well prepared. Presented with confidence.                                     | Presentation was excellent; Slides were well prepared. Confident and relaxed throughout the presentation.                       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| <b>Q &amp; A</b>            |                                | ● ●  | ● ● ●  | ● ● ●   | ● ● ●   | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● | ● ● ● |       |
|                             |                                | Absent from presentation; Unable to answer any question even after much prompting.           | Unable to explain what is written on the slides; Answers are incorrect or too general in attempt to handwave or distract from the real question. | 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 A or A+ for any of the assessed criteria above, please provide reasons to justify the assessment**

Q1 Is this project worth considering for award, such as “Outstanding Undergraduate Researcher Prize (OURP)”, “Best FYP/UROP/Computing Project”, SoC Innovation Prize, etc.? *(please provide justification in the table 3 above)*

NO  YES

Q2. Does the project have good commercial potential?

- Strong potential
- Good potential
- No potential / not intended for commercial purposes