

CDS590 Consultancy Project & Practicum Evaluation Form (Examiner)

Candidate Name : _____
Project Title : _____
Name of evaluator : _____

Element	Weight	Very Poor (0-1)	Poor (2-3)	Satisfactory (4-5)	Good (6-7)	Very Good (8-10)	Mark Multiplier	Total Marks
Final Report (20%)								
Abstract	10						X1	/10
Introduction	10						X1	/10
Related Work	15						X1.5	/15
Research Methodology	25						X2.5	/25
Results and Discussion	20						X2.0	/20
Conclusion & Lesson Learned	10						X1	/10
References & Citations	10						X1	/10
Total (Final Report)								/100
Final Report (20%)							X0.2	/20
Presentation (10%)								
Subject Knowledge	20						X2	/20
Organization	10						X1	/10
Contents	40						X4	/40
Delivery	30						X3	/30
Total (Presentation)								/100
Presentation (10%)							X0.10	/10
Total	Final Report: _____/20 + Presentation: _____/10							/30

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Grading Rubrics [Final Report]

Grade Range	Abstract [10%]	Introduction [10%]	Related Work [15%]	Research Methodology [25%]	Results & Discussion [20%]	Conclusion & Lesson Learned [10%]	References & Citations [10%]
A Range (Very good) (10-8)	Abstract is thorough and complete. Clearly state the practicum experience, objectives, DSA methods, results and conclusion(s).	Introduction (problem statement, background of practicum company, domain) are very clear.	Systematic, extensive and very good synthesis on the related work.	Demonstrates clear understanding and proper use of methodology in analyzing use case. Identifies relevant strengths and weaknesses of DSA technique. Excellent justification of selected DSA technique.	Results are shown clearly with evaluation. Discussion include comparison with other works and outcome from practicum experience.	Summary of important findings and statement of lesson learned are very clear and comprehensive.	All references and citations are correctly written and present.
B Range (Good) (7-6)	Abstract is complete. Fairly state the practicum experience, objectives, DSA methods, results and conclusion(s).	Introduction (problem statement, background of practicum company, domain) are clear.	Extensive and good synthesis on the related work.	Demonstrates proficient knowledge of methodology in analyzing use case. Good justification of selected DSA technique.	Results are shown adequately with evaluation. Discussion include comparison with other works and outcome from practicum experience.	Summary of important findings and statement of lesson learned are clear and comprehensive.	One or two reference or citations missing or incorrectly written.
C Range (Satisfactory) (5-4)	Abstract is partially complete. Fairly state the practicum experience, objectives, DSA methods. Results and conclusion(s) were not stated.	Introduction (problem statement, background of practicum company, domain) are partially clear.	Sufficient and fair synthesis on the related work.	Demonstrates appropriate knowledge of methodology in analyzing use case. Fair justification for selected DSA technique.	Results are partially clear with weak evaluation. Discussion include limited comparison with other works and and outcome from practicum experience.	Summary of important findings and statement of lesson learned are partially clear but not comprehensive.	Several references or citations missing or incorrectly written.
D Range (Poor) (3-2)	Abstract is poor. Hardly state the practicum experience, objectives, DSA methods.	Introduction (problem statement, background of practicum company, domain) are not clear.	Insufficient and unsatisfactory synthesis of the related work.	The methodology is not appropriate for study and understanding is not demonstrated.	Results are ambiguous with no evaluation. Discussion does not include comparison with other works nor outcome from practicum experience.	Summary of important findings and statement of lesson learned are vague.	Reference and citation errors detract significantly from paper.
F Range (Very Poor) (0-1)	Abstract is very poor. Does not state the practicum experience, objectives, DSA methods.	No introduction (problem statement, background of practicum company, domain).	No synthesis of the related work.	There is no methodology.	No results and discussion.	No conclusion and lesson learned.	No references and citations.

Grading Rubrics [Presentation]

Grade Range	Subject Knowledge [20%]	Organization [10%]	Contents [40%]	Delivery [30%]
A Range (Very good) (10-8)	Has presented full knowledge of both problem and solution. Answers to questions are strengthen by rationalization and explanation.	Information articulated clearly and is organized in a structured way with logical flow between parts.	All key points are covered. Enhances presentation and keeps interest by effective use of charts, graphs, figures etc., to explain salient points.	Student confidence is noteworthy. Speaks very clearly and eloquently. Manipulates tone, speed, and volume, to emphasize important ideas and hold the listener's attention greatly.
B Range (Good) (7-6)	Has competent knowledge and is at ease with information. Can answer questions but without rationalization and explanation.	Information articulated clearly but the flow is somewhat hampered.	All key points are covered but limited use of charts, graphs, figures, etc., to explain salient points.	Student confidence is good. Speaks clearly and eloquently. Uses tone, speed, and volume to emphasize important ideas and hold the listener's attention.
C Range (Satisfactory) (5-4)	Is uncomfortable with information. Seems novice and can answer basic questions only.	Information articulated clearly but it is difficult to follow the presentation.	All key points are covered but no use of charts, graphs, figures, etc., to explain salient points.	Student confidence is fair. Speaks fairly clear but less eloquent with some vocals fillers. Holds attention of listener fairly.
D Range (Poor) (3-2)	Has less knowledge of both problem and solution. Cannot answer most of the questions.	Information is arranged in confused way.	Key points are partially covered. Poor, distracts audience and is hard to understand.	Student lacks confidence. Difficult to understand what was spoken. Distracting vocals fillers throughout the presentation.
F Range (Very Poor) (0-1)	Has very less or not knowledge of both problem and solution. Cannot answer all questions.	Information is not arranged and unstructured.	Key points are not covered. Very poor, distracts audience and is hard to interpret.	Student has no confidence. Hardly speaks.