

## **Assessment for A0216695U (NG JONG RAY, EDWARD) - in group 16**

### **Assessment 1: Progress report: 1/1**

**Comments:** All groups submitted these on time. Thank you.

### **Assessment 2: Video: 4/5**

**Comments:** (Gp) The video was methodical, stepping through properties and the construction.

### **Assessment 3: Report clarity: 4/5**

**Comments:** (Gp) The paper was clear.

### **Assessment 4: Report depth: 8/10**

**Comments:** (Gp) You adopted a challenging topic. Actually more you tried challenging properties for your topic, which I appreciated. You explained the properties well, and they seemed convincing. You presented a construction and proof.

### **Assessment 5: Peer assessment: 4/4**

**Comments:** Your teammates said this about you: Provided significant amount of ideas and contents for our paper. Actively sought for tasks that had not been done and took responsibility for them. Edward often proposes different view of the problems that other group members brought up during meetings. He also provided excellent feedback to the ideation and the writing of the report at the end and is overall an excellent team player. Edward was the driving force behind this project and brought to the table multiple good ideas and directions that assisted us in completing the group project.

### **Your final assessment: 21/25**

## Comments on the assessment of the project

You were assessed in various areas. The areas were:

**Progress report/1:** All groups gave timely progress reports.

**Video/5:** A subjective assessment of your video. For this assessment, if I felt that your work was minimal, you tended to get marks in the range 1-2 range. A strong video received 4-5.

**Report clarity/5:** A subjective assessment of your paper, which was supposed to be a report including an outline of your proposed system(s), along with elements related to the system - properties, proofs and so on. In this submission, I expected to see that you gave a clear description of the context/domain, and covered a plausible range of properties with adversarial games, and perhaps proofs, that would support this context. For this assessment, if I felt that your work was minimal, you tended to get marks in the range 1-2 range. Marks of 4-5 were reserved for those submissions that were outstandingly clear.

**Report depth/10:** A subjective assessment of the depth of the content of your presentations. Marks in the range 3-5 were reserved for poorly presented submissions with weak or partial constructs (systems, properties, adversarial games, constructions and proofs). Marks in the range 6-8 were for plausible systems. Marks in the range 9-10 were for those presentations that were a model of completeness.

**Peer assessment/4:** Your peer assessment comes from your group members. The mark was checked for consistency with my view.

Here is the marking rubric for the principal elements of your assessment:

	<b>Very poor</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Med/High</b>	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>Video</b> (5 marks)	<b>1</b> Minimal presentation	<b>2</b> OK, but...	<b>3</b> Explained the core elements.	<b>4</b> Gave extra clarity to paper.	<b>5</b> Exemplar.
<b>Clarity</b> (5 marks)	<b>1</b> Idle thoughts of idle minds.	<b>2</b> Good outline of ideas, followed format.	<b>3</b> Clear framework, plausible elements.	<b>4</b> Clear framework, proofs, justification.	<b>5</b> Exemplar, sustained throughout.
<b>Depth</b> (10 marks)	<b>1-3</b> Idle thoughts of idle minds.	<b>4-5</b> Followed the class framework mostly.	<b>6</b> Reasonable arguments and components presented.	<b>7-8</b> All arguments appear sound, clear recognition of issues remaining.	<b>9-10</b> Exemplar, research quality.