

1. SELF/PEER ASSESSMENT FORM

Project Name:	I42 – Human Fall Detection Using RGB Camera		
Your Name:	Nguyen Nam Tung		
Your ID	103181157	Date	29/10/2024

Self/Peer Assessment Form

The main purpose of this form is for all Team members to reflect on their interactions, but it may also be helpful in resolving disputes over the relative contributions of Team members.

Using the **Self and Peer Assessment Form** below

1. List the members of your Project Team
2. Enter a score between 0 and 5, for categories A to J for all members of the team (see Section 3 for definitions)
3. Further provide detailed comments on each member

Please include yourself, ie, self-assessment.

(adapted from Winger-aunty, S. 1990. University of Wisconsin-Stout Modified by Pheroza Daruwalla and Ian Knowd, 1994.)

No.	Team Member Names (including yourself)	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	Total
1	Nguyen Nam Tung	5	5	4	4	5	4	5	4	5	5	46
2	Garrich Farrell Hardjojuwono	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50
3	Leon Nguyen	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	43
4	Nick Bui	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50
5	Rehman Ali	2	2	3	2	3	3	5	4	3	3	30
6	Chirag Chirag	4	2	4	4	2	4	5	4	4	3	36
7												
8												
9												
10												

Detailed Comments:

No.	Team Member Names	Comments
1	Nguyen Nam Tung	For my capstone project, I delivered exceptional performance across all areas, including coding, reporting, deployment, debugging, and performance monitoring of the fall detection system. I was responsible for all UI development and handled the integration between the backend and frontend, ensuring seamless functionality. Once the product was completed, I focused on optimizing its performance, implementing improvements that enhanced its overall efficiency. Throughout the project, I maintained clear and effective communication within the team, keeping everyone aligned and informed on progress and updates. My contributions to this project were significant, especially compared to my previous project, and played a key role in driving the project's success.
2	Garrich Farrell Hardjojuwono	Garrich stands out as an exceptional member of our team. His work is consistently top-notch in term of both coding and reporting, showcasing his deep understanding and skills. Garrich has a unique way of inspiring everyone around him while also taking the time to really listen to others, which has greatly improved our team's unity and motivation. His drive and proactive approach help him creatively solve tough problems with ease
3	Leon Nguyen	Leon made a significant contribution to our project, particularly in the areas of UI design and report writing. Her work on the user interface was thorough and detail-oriented, helping create a visually appealing and user-friendly design that aligns well with our project goals. She also took on a substantial portion of the reporting tasks, ensuring that our documentation was clear, organized, and professional.
4	Nick Bui	Nick Bui has been fantastic in our project. He consistently delivers excellent work, setting a high standard for the team. He's great at communicating and really connects with everyone, which motivates us all. Nick always goes above and beyond, pushing our project to new heights. His reliability and ability to inspire our team have been essential in keeping everyone motivated and focused. He did a lot in term of model coding reporting and adjustment of Chirag, making sure that everything is of high quality
5	Rehman Ali	Rehman had the least satisfactory performance in the group. He was assigned a smaller workload and the simplest sections of the reports, yet his output consistently fell below the group's quality expectations, suggesting a lack of effort. That said, I recognize that he put forth his best effort in areas like reporting, usability testing, and refining the reports to align with the project scope.

Self/Peer Review

6	Chirag Chirag	Compared to last semester, Chirag's performance noticeably declined. While he took responsibility for one of the models, the quality of his work required the team to redo his part. He also provided inaccurate information about the dataset quality, even though Nick and Garrich were able to work effectively with it without issue. This inconsistency suggested that the problem likely stemmed from his approach rather than the dataset itself. His contributions were inefficient and fell short of the expected quality, leading to wasted team time. However, he still made a meaningful impact through his work in testing and reporting, providing support in these areas.
---	---------------	--

2. Project Client Review

Review the Project/Client experience below. Be critical but fair in your assessment

Questions	Yes/No
Client provided a clear vision for the students	Yes
Client was available to the students in the first week	No
Client is available for every meeting	Yes
You felt Client answers all students questions satisfactorily and clearly	No
You felt Client provides complete and clear requirements	Yes
The Client usually answers all the emails	No
The Client usually answers all the emails within a few days	Yes
The Client keeps changing the requirements	Yes
The Client communicates regularly	Yes
It is easy to communicate with the Client	Yes
The Client gives conflicting statements in different meetings	No
The Client provides constructive feedback	Yes
The Client provides (or helps in acquiring) all the required resources for the project (e.g. hardware, software, reading material etc.)	Yes
Based on the outcome produced are the project expectations realistic for the first 12 weeks involvement?	Yes
I am finding it a good experience with the Client	Yes
Dealing with the Client is relatively easy	Yes
Issues with the Client are dealt with professionally	Yes
Any Additional Remarks!	

3. Categories

A. Quantity of Work

- 0 – Did nothing, was uninvolved.
- 1 – Does enough to get by.
- 2 – Occasionally exceeds standards, needs improvement.
- 3 – Satisfactory. Does more than what is required.
- 4 – Very industrious. High Quality. Consistent.
- 5 – Always exceeds productivity standards. Outstanding.

B. Quality of Work

- 0 – Careless. Makes frequent mistakes. Assignment suffers.
- 1 – Mistakes frequent enough to question results.
- 2 – Work is basically correct.
- 3 – Accurate when and where it really counts. Satisfactory.
- 4 – Almost always accurate in all areas of contribution.
- 5 – Outstanding. Perfect quality. No mistakes.

C. Communication Skills

- 0 – Blunt, discourteous, does not listen, antagonistic, distant, aloof.
- 1 – Sometime tactless. Approachable and friendly once known by others.
- 2 – Agreeable and pleasant. Warm, friendly, sociable and listens.
- 3 – Always very polite and willing to help. Very sociable and outgoing. Listens and understands.
- 4 – Courteous and very pleasant. Excellent at establishing good will.
- 5 – Inspiring to others. Artful listener. Really understands.

D. Initiative

- 0 – Displays no self-starting characteristics. Acts without purpose.
- 1 – Puts forth little effort. Requires prodding, sets no speed records.
- 2 – Puts in minimal effort to get task completed.
- 3 – Strives hard. Desire to achieve.
- 4 – High desire to achieve. Always puts in a solid days work.
- 5 – Sets high goals. Self-starter with high motivation. Constantly goes beyond call of duty.

E. Efficiency

- 0 – Work is invariably late.
- 1 – Work occasionally completed on schedule.
- 2 – Work usually complete on schedule. Some contribution to minor problem solving.
- 3 – Work always complete on schedule.
- 4 – Work complete. Consistent in defining and resolving major problems.
- 5 – Work invariably done ahead of schedule. Imaginative. Can be counted on to make major contributions.

F. Personal Relations

- 0 – A very disruptive influence
- 1 – Is a source of some friction
- 2 – Causes no problems.
- 3 – Satisfactory, harmonious.
- 4 – Is a positive factor.
- 5 – Respected by others. Presence adds to environmental stability.

G. Group Meeting Attendance

- 0 – Never attended any meetings. Showed no interest.
- 1 – Occasionally attended. Would commit and then not show.
- 2 – Sometimes uncooperative in planning schedule. Hard to get in touch with.

Self/Peer Review

- 3 – Would attend. Usually late.
- 4 – Could be counted on to attend.
- 5 – Never missed a meeting. Always on time.

H. Attitude and Enthusiasm

- 0 – Poor disposition, uninvolved, indifferent.
- 1 – Unenthusiastic, biased.
- 2 – Half hearted.
- 3 – Positive demeanour.
- 4 – Positive attitude and spirited.
- 5 – Exuberant and eager. Positive influence. Inspiring to others. Team builder.

I. Effort

- 0 – Puts forth no effort. Expects others to carry the load.
- 1 – Puts forth some effort.
- 2 – Displays enough effort to get by.
- 3 – Solid contributions.
- 4 – Strives very hard. Energetic.
- 5 – Self starter. Consistently goes beyond call of duty.

J. Dependability

- 0 – Uninvolved. Unreliable.
- 1 – Unsteady, but tries somewhat.
- 2 – Occasionally would come through. Inconsistent.
- 3 – Needs some improvement. Suitable.
- 4 – Very trustworthy. Could be counted on to take responsibility.
- 5 – Always responsible. Kept the group together and in the right direction. Steady influence.