



**School of Computing
Continual 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 15 % 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 of the problem (30%)	Motivation and objectives	● ● ●			● ● ●			● ● ●		
		Does not have good understanding of the scope of the project and objectives unclear or unstated.	Objectives are enumerated, but superficial understanding of the problem and motivation for the project	Shows clear understanding for the motivation for the project and has clearly outlined the objectives.						
	Issues, Constraints and assumptions	● ● ●			● ● ●			● ● ●		
		Little awareness of constraints & assumptions. No idea on issues involved and how to solve the problem. Shows little interest in the project.	Poses some questions for further inquiry mainly based on previous work, but cannot visualize the assumptions that have to be made to arrive at the solution.	Poses a depth and breadth of relevant questions for further inquiry. Well aware of shortcomings/constraints of current/own work and ready to propose new changes to improve the results achieved at this stage.						
Literature survey and review of previous works	● ● ●			● ● ●			● ● ●			
	Review of existing work is not evident and references used are outdated or irrelevant.	Adequate literature survey, but relevance of literature survey to the project is not made clear.	Literature review and previous project works is up-to-date and critical.							
Technical Achievement (40%)	Formulation and problem statement	● ● ●			● ● ●			● ● ●		
		Has difficulty in conceptualization and definition of the problem. Problem statement is not formulated clearly or shows little interest in doing so.	Has formulated the problem to some extent, and is still putting some efforts towards some viable solutions/plans to address difficulties encountered.	Good formulation of the problem statement with clear and viable objectives.						
Research/design methodology	● ● ●			● ● ●			● ● ●			
	Not thought of appropriate research/design or investigative method/ design.	Although the problem not fully researched or investigated; appropriateness of the method is adequate.	Disciplined, well thought out investigation/design method; justification for research/design method is given.							

		● ● ●	● ● ●	● ● ●
	Resources/tools required/used, demos/analysis of initial results	No clear specification of the problem; Inadequate details on the implementation strategy; No idea on resources/tools required.	Partial specification of the problem; Details on the implementation strategy is sketchy; Some tools/resources are identified but not all.	Has verified or demonstrated accuracy of results obtained. Some initial prototype developed/ results presented Good analysis given to support understanding.

Table 2: Effort/Initiative and Report

	Sub-criteria	Level of Achievement									
		-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	
Effort and 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.								
Report (10%)	Writing style	● ● ●	● ● ●	● ● ●				● ● ●			
		Writing is disorganized and difficult to read and understand.	Writing style indicates planning that makes reading easy; Content is sufficient and largely relevant.	Writing is clear, concise, and comprehensive.							

		● ● ●	● ● ●	● ● ●
	Content	Report is sketchy and appears as last minute effort. Work reported is either trivial or not used in the work performed	Work reported presents some preliminary thoughts on design/investigation.	Work reported is entirely relevant to the work performed. Not only presents preliminary thoughts on design/investigation, but also includes justification for chosen design/investigative methodology.

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

Feedback to the Student *(please be concise and write one or two sentences for each)*

Please provide constructive feedback to the student to enable him/her to make progress in the right direction by indicating the scope of the work the student is expected to complete within the project time frame, weakness in the work done so far, and areas for improvement. This will be sent to the student.

Student's understanding of the problem

Work done and amount of effort invested so far

Areas of weakness

Areas for improvement

What is expected at the end of the project

Other comments

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

Project Information

Should student continue with this FYP?

Yes No

You may update the project title, keywords or project nature if the scope differs from the original proposal now.

Title



**School of Computing
Continual 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 15% 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 of the problem (30%)	Motivation and objectives	● ● ●			● ● ●			● ● ●		
		Does not have good understanding of the scope of the project and objectives unclear or unstated.	Objectives are enumerated, but superficial understanding of the problem and motivation for the project	Shows clear understanding for the motivation for the project and has clearly outlined the objectives.						
	Issues, Constraints and assumptions	● ● ●			● ● ●			● ● ●		
		Little awareness of constraints & assumptions. No idea on issues involved and how to solve the problem. Shows little interest in the project.	Poses some questions for further inquiry mainly based on previous work, but cannot visualize the assumptions that have to be made to arrive at the solution.	Poses a depth and breadth of relevant questions for further inquiry. Well aware of shortcomings/constraints of current/own work and ready to propose new changes to improve the results achieved at this stage.						
	Literature survey and review of previous works	● ● ●			● ● ●			● ● ●		
		Review of existing work is not evident and references used are outdated or irrelevant.	Adequate literature survey, but relevance of literature survey to the project is not made clear.	Literature review and previous project works is up-to-date and critical.						
Technical Achievement (40%)	Formulation and problem statement	● ● ●			● ● ●			● ● ●		
		Has difficulty in conceptualization and definition of the problem. Problem statement is not formulated clearly or shows little interest in doing so.	Has formulated the problem to some extent, and is still putting some efforts towards some viable solutions/plans to address difficulties encountered.	Good formulation of the problem statement with clear and viable objectives.						
	Research/design methodology	● ● ●			● ● ●			● ● ●		
		Not thought of appropriate research/design or investigative method/ design.	Although the problem not fully researched or investigated; appropriateness of the method is adequate.	Disciplined, well thought out investigation/design method; justification for research/design method is given.						
	Resources/tools required/used, demos/analysis of initial results	● ● ●			● ● ●			● ● ●		
		No clear specification of the problem; Inadequate details on the implementation strategy; No idea on resources/tools required.	Partial specification of the problem; Details on the implementation strategy is sketchy; Some tools/resources are identified but not all.	Has verified or demonstrated accuracy of results obtained. Some initial prototype developed/ results presented Good analysis given to support understanding.						

Table 2: Project/Resource Management and Report/Discussion

	Sub-criteria	Level of Achievement									
		-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	
Project and Resource Management (10%)	Project Management		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
		Little evidence of use of project management techniques.	Use of project management techniques with evidence of application.			Demonstrates continuous usage of project management techniques					
	Resource Management		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
		Little evidence of good resource management e.g. late decision on hardware/software platform, tools to use, or unplanned or no clue.	Some evidence of resource management but mainly on a reactive basis. Has identified the tools/software/hardware required, but yet to use it.			Has not only identified all tools and resources, but has a good grip on them and has shown evidence of using them adequately.					
Report and Discussion (20%)	Report - content		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
		Report is sketchy and appears as last minute effort. Some material under literature survey are irrelevant.	Report covers relevant prior work as part of literature survey.			Report discusses prior work and presents ideas clearly and concisely.					
	Report - Writing style		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
		Writing is disorganized and difficult to read and understand	Writing style indicates planning that makes reading easy; Content is sufficient and largely relevant.			Writing is clear, concise, and comprehensive.					
	Work reported		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
		Work reported is either trivial or not used in the work performed	Work reported presents some preliminary thoughts on design/investigation.			Work reported is entirely relevant to the work performed. Not only presents preliminary thoughts on design/investigation, but also includes justification for chosen design/investigative methodology.					
Discussion		●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	
	Unable to explain what the project is about and unable to answer many questions asked.	Able to articulate the problem and work done reasonably well. Understands the questions asked and is able to provide concise answers in most cases.			Has very good grasp of the project. Understands questions asked without prompting, and provides relevant and detail answers.						

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

Feedback to the Student and Supervisor *(please be concise and write one or two sentences for each)*

Please provide constructive feedback to the student to enable him/her to make progress in the right direction by indicating the scope of the work the student is expected to complete within the project time frame, weakness in the work done so far, and areas for improvement. This will be sent to both supervisor and the student.

<p>Student's understanding of the problem</p> <p>-----</p>
<p>Work done and amount of effort invested so far</p> <p>-----</p>
<p>Areas of weakness</p> <p>-----</p>

Feedback to the Supervisor only *(please be concise and write one or two sentences for each)*

Please provide feedback to the supervisor on the project, its scope and complexity, and likely contribution of the student based on his/her ability and understanding so far. Please also indicate if there is a need to reduce or expand the scope of the project.

Scope of the work involved (too ambitious, too little, typical) -----
Student's ability to cope with the work -----
Nature of the project & whether it encompasses different phases of project development -----

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