

# RP - Proposal Report Mark Sheet [Total contribution = 5%] Group ID

Student ID:

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Student Name:

--

Sub Assessment Criteria	Excellent (100 - 75)	Good (74 - 60)	Average (59 - 40)	Below Avg. (39 - 0)	Marks [Out of 100]
<b>Proven gap/Creative Solution [Based on LO1] - [35%]</b>					
1.Knowledge gap (Problem) with novel and creative solution 70%	Clearly argued the existence of knowledge gap using credible, multiple sources. Excellent justification for novelty and creativity.	Sufficiently argued the existence of knowledge gap using limited sources. Good justification for novelty and creativity.	Moderately argued the knowledge gap with very few or no sources. Average justification for novelty and creativity.	Knowledge gap is not clearly identified. Poor or No justification for novelty and creativity.	
2.Compare existing systems and related work 30%	Extensively compared the research problem in the present context of the research domain / with similar products and services.	Sufficiently compared the research problem in the present context of the research domain / with similar products and services.	Moderately compared the research problem in the present context of the research domain / with similar products and services	Poorly compared or No comparison has been done	
<b>Capability in applying the knowledge in particular stream [Based on LO2] - [30%]</b>					
3.Application of key pillars in the specialized area of knowledge 50%	Clearly identified the most appropriate research area (Machine learning, Image processing, Data Science etc.)	Satisfactorily identified the research area.	Vaguely identified. But appropriateness is doubtful.	Indistinctly identified or Not identified.	
4.Application of technologies in the relevant key pillar/area 50%	Demonstrated full awareness of technologies in the relevant area and a critical evaluation of technologies proving selection of the best technology/s.	Adequate awareness of technologies to be used and a good evaluation of technologies proving selection of the best technologies.	Moderate awareness of technologies to be used.	Poor or Zero awareness of technologies to be used.	
<b>Solution Implementation [Based on LO3] - [5%]</b>					
5.High-level System Architecture and identification of self-evaluation plan/criteria 50%	Brilliantly justified high-level SA with highly acceptable self-evaluation plan.	Adequately justified high-level SA with acceptable self-evaluation plan.	Barely justified high-level SA with fairly acceptable self-evaluation plan.	Poorly justified or No evidence of High-level SA with inappropriate or No self-evaluation plan.	
6.User Requirements / Functional Requirements 20%	Comprehensive and realistic user requirements and the functional requirements well described.	Comprehensive and realistic user requirements and the functional requirements adequately described.	Comprehensive and realistic user requirements and the functional requirements barely described.	Comprehensive and realistic user requirements and the functional requirements poorly described.	
7.Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) 30%	Comprehensive planning demonstrate in WBS, realistic time estimates and right workload distribution.	Good planning demonstrate in WBS, realistic time estimates and good workload distribution.	Satisfactory planning of WBS, barely feasible time estimates and acceptable workload distribution.	Poor or No planning of WBS, Unrealistic time estimates and unacceptable workload distribution.	
<b>Effective Communication [Based on LO4] - [15%]</b>					
8.Idea delivery 50%	Excellent explanation of proposal content (objectives and methodology etc.), with logical discussion of the system's features.	Sufficiently explained the proposal content (objectives and methodology etc.), with good discussion of system's features.	Proposal content explained but containing some irrelevant information.	Weakly explained the proposal content with lot of irrelevant information.	
9.Structure and mechanics of language 30%	Excellent structure and formatting, meaningful chapters (as recommended) with logical flow. Excellent language usage without grammatical and typographical errors.	Acceptable structure and formatting, meaningful chapters (as recommended) with logical flow. Fairly good language usage with very few grammatical and typographical errors	Poorly designed structure and formatting. Many grammatical and typographical errors.	Unacceptable structure. Very poor writing.	
10.Referencing (IEEE) 20%	Proper citing and referencing.	Acceptable level of citing and referencing.	Few citations with incorrect referencing.	Very few or No citations and incorrect or No referencing	
<b>Ability of commercialization / potential for entrepreneurship [Based on LO5] - [15%]</b>					
11.Ability of commercialization / potential for entrepreneurship 100%	Demonstrated sound evidence to prove business potential highlighting many achievable user benefits	Sufficient evidence to prove business potential highlighting some achievable user benefits	Few evidence to prove business potential with few user benefits	Very few or No evidence to prove business potential with unachievable or No user benefits	
Comments					

Co-Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_