DD2424: Evaluation form for group project

| Pro | oject title: | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------------------|------|------------|------|
| Na | me student 1: | | | | | | | | | |
| Na | me student 2: | | | | | | | | | |
| Na | me student 3: | | | | | | | | | |
| Gra | ader's name: | | | | | | | | | |
| Ει | valuation of the written repor | t | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Overall readability of the report: | \bigcirc | Excellen | $_{ m it}$ | ○ G | ood | \bigcirc | Fine | \bigcirc | Poor |
| 2. | Overall presentation of technical detail: | \bigcirc | Excellen | $_{ m t}$ | \bigcirc G | ood | \bigcirc | Fine | \bigcirc | Poor |
| 3. | Presentation of problem formulation: | \bigcirc | Excellen | $_{ m it}$ | \bigcirc G | ood | \bigcirc | Fine | \bigcirc | Poor |
| 4. | Presentation of proposed approach: | \bigcirc | Excellen | $_{ m it}$ | \bigcirc G | ood | \bigcirc | Fine | \bigcirc | Poor |
| 5. | Quality of prior work section: | \bigcirc | Excellen | $_{ m it}$ | \bigcirc G | ood | \bigcirc | Fine | \bigcirc | Poor |
| 6. | Quality & relevance of experiments: | \bigcirc | Excellen | $_{ m it}$ | \bigcirc G | ood | \bigcirc | Fine | \bigcirc | Poor |
| 7. | Conclusions and discussion: | \bigcirc | Excellen | $_{ m it}$ | \bigcirc G | ood | \bigcirc | Fine | \bigcirc | Poor |
| 8. | Quality of execution of idea: | \bigcirc | Excellen | $_{ m nt}$ | \bigcirc G | ood | \bigcirc | Fine | \bigcirc | Poor |
| 9. | Ambition level of project: | \bigcirc | Very hig | gh | ○ H | ligh | \bigcirc | Fine | \bigcirc | Low |
| 10. | Basic premise of project - how interesting: | \bigcirc | Very | \bigcirc (| Quite | \bigcirc | Fine | | Low | 7 |
| 11. | Novelty of project: | \bigcirc | Very hig | gh | (H | ligh | \bigcirc | Fine | \bigcirc | Low |
| 12. | Proper citations: | \bigcirc | Fine (|) I | nsuffic | cient | | | | |
| Ει | valuation of oral presentation | & | questi | on | ing | | | | | |
| 1. | Clarity of the presentation: | \bigcirc | Excellen | $_{ m it}$ | \bigcirc G | ood | \bigcirc | Fine | \bigcirc | Poor |
| 2. | Quality of the presentation: | \bigcirc | Excellen | $_{ m it}$ | \bigcirc G | ood | \bigcirc | Fine | \bigcirc | Poor |
| 3. | Answers to implementation questions: | \bigcirc | Excellen | $_{ m tt}$ | \bigcirc G | ood | \bigcirc | Fine | \bigcirc | Poor |
| 4. | Answers to background theory questions: | \bigcirc | Excellen | $_{ m nt}$ | \bigcirc G | ood | \bigcirc | Fine | \bigcirc | Poor |
| 5. | Student 1 performance: | \bigcirc | Bonus | \bigcirc | Defa | ult | \bigcirc $^{\prime}$ | Veak | | |
| 6. | Student 2 performance: | \bigcirc | Bonus | \bigcirc | Defa | ult | \bigcirc $^{\prime}$ | Veak | | |
| 7. | Student 3 performance: | 0 | Bonus | 0 | Defa | ult | \circ | Veak | | |

1 Transform evaluations to grade

Each criterion, R_i , has a corresponding maximum score S_{R_i} . This score is multiplied by the numeric conversion, P_{R_i} , of its evaluation. The points awarded for most questions, R_i , are computed as:

$$S_{R_i} \times P_{R_i}$$

Table 1: The maximum scores for each criterion examined for the written report and the oral presentation and examination.

| Criterion | Max score (S_{R_i}) |
|-----------|-----------------------|
| R_1 | 5 |
| R_2 | 5 |
| R_3 | 5 |
| R_4 | 5 |
| R_5 | 5 |
| R_6 | 10 |
| R_7 | 3 |
| R_8 | 12 |
| R_9 | - |
| R_{10} | 5 |
| R_{11} | 5 |
| R_{12} | 3 |

| Criterion | $\mathbf{Max} \ \mathbf{score} \ (S_{O_i})$ |
|-------------|---|
| O_1 | 10 |
| O_2 | 10 |
| O_3 | 10 |
| O_4 | 10 |
| $O_{5,6,7}$ | - |

Max scores for the written report criteria

Max scores for the oral examination criteria

Tables 1, 2 and 3 give an overview of the maximum scores for each grading criteria and how the evaluations of these criteria are converted into probabilities.

Table 2: The conversion of evaluation of the criteria for the written report into percentages. For the leftmost table $1 \le i \le 8$.

| Eval | P_{R_i} | Eval | P_{R_9} | Eval | $P_{R_{10}}$ | Eval | $P_{R_{11}}$ | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Excellent | 1 | Very high | 1.2 | Very | 1.2 | Very high | 1.2 | Eval | $P_{R_{12}}$ |
| Good | .8 | High | 1.1 | Quite | 1.1 | High | 1.1 | Fine | 0 |
| Fine | .6 | Fine | 1 | Fine | 1 | Fine | 1 | Insufficient | -1 |
| Poor | .4 | Low | .8 | Low | .8 | Low | .8 | | |

The formula for converting the evaluations of each criteria for the written report to a final score:

$$S_{\text{report}} = \sum_{i=1}^{7} S_{R_i} P_{R_i} + S_{R_8} P_{R_8} P_{R_9} + \sum_{i=10}^{12} S_{R_i} P_{R_i}$$
(1)

The formula for converting the evaluations of each criteria for the oral examination and presentation to a final score for student j:

$$S_{\text{oral},j} = P_{O_{4+j}} \sum_{i=1}^{4} S_{O_i} P_{O_i}$$
 (2)

Table 3: The conversion of evaluation of the criteria for the oral presentation and examination into percentages. For the leftmost table $1 \le i \le 4$.

| Eval P_{O_i} | |
|---|------------------------|
| $\underline{\phantom{aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa$ | al $P_{O_{\{5,6,7\}}}$ |
| Excellent 1 Good .8 Fine .6 Poor .4 Boo | nus 1.2 fault 1 |

The final score for student j is then given by

$$S_j = S_{\text{report}} + S_{\text{oral},j} \tag{3}$$

The final grade for the student is then determined by this grading table:

| A | В | \mathbf{C} | D | ${f E}$ | \mathbf{F} |
|-----------|-----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| ≥ 90 | ≥ 80 | ≥ 65 | ≥ 50 | ≥ 40 | < 40 |

2 Here is an example of the scoring and grading in action

| Criterion | Max Score | Evaluation |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| R.1 | 5 | 1 |
| R.2 | 5 | 0.8 |
| R.3 | 5 | 0.8 |
| R.4 | 5 | 0.6 |
| R.5 | 5 | 0.4 |
| R.6 | 10 | 1 |
| R.7 | 3 | 0.8 |
| R.8 | 12 | 1 |
| R.9 | 1 | 0.8 |
| R.10 | 5 | 0.8 |
| R.11 | 5 | 0.8 |
| R.12 | 3 | 0 |
| O.1 | 10 | 0.8 |
| O.2 | 10 | 0.8 |
| O.3 | 10 | 0.8 |
| O.4 | 10 | 0.8 |
| O.5 | 1 | 1 |
| | 100 | 80 |