

Project

Dr S. S. Chandra

The theory of computation depends on a number of important topics too vast to fully cover in a single semester course. The project assessment is an opportunity to choose and gain more experience in either a standard computation theory related topic or a topic that is one of particular interest to you.

The goal is to not only demonstrate that you have completed the assigned tasks and have reasonable understanding of the material, but to develop presentation and communication skills by way of an additional poster presentation in conjunction with the demonstration.

In this project, you will complete a laboratory (like previous demonstration assessments) chosen from a list of available laboratories provided on Blackboard. For the assessment marks and grading, the following steps must be completed:

1. **Laboratory:** Complete the tasks given in the laboratory sheet of the laboratory you have chosen for the laboratory.
2. **Poster Demo:** Complete, demonstrate and present your poster of the laboratory and the tasks you have completed of the laboratory you have chosen by the Demo due date.
3. **Submission:** Submit the code and the poster presented to their respective Turn-it-in submission links on Blackboard by the Submission due date.

The marks will be award for the project based on the marking criteria provided later in this document.

Laboratory

Choose ONE laboratory to complete from a list of available laboratories provided on Blackboard in the Project Assessment page. These labs will be similar in difficulty as previous labs held during the course. If you are unsure which one is good for you, the Busy Beaver lab is recommended for most students.

Poster Demo

You will need to create a poster of the laboratory you have completed. The poster must be an A4 or A3 poster, which will support your demonstration. You do not have to print your poster for the demonstration. Your demonstration will be similar to your previous demonstrations but should include the poster to make your presentation clearer and concise, see marking criteria for details.

The poster should clearly identify the Laboratory title, present relevant background information, and clearly show results and have concluding remarks. The supplied template may be used and is available on Blackboard.

The Poster Demonstration will be assessed on both its content and presentation by the examiner (which will be your tutor). You should present the key content of the lab in a fashion that suits a live demonstration, including the poster. The demonstration and poster should show that you have:

- Created a piece of working software or generated experimental results
- Presented essential background material
- Creatively and meaningfully presented outcomes

- Drawn and presented useful conclusions
- Attracted examiner attention by the content of the poster and the demonstration
- Effectively answered questions raised by the examiner

The marking criteria will be used by the examiner to arrive at a mark for the assessment (see Marking Criteria section).

Submission

Submissions of the following items must be made via their respective Turn-it-in links:

1. The code for your laboratory work must be submitted as a **single PDF file submission** to the Turn-it-in link provided on Blackboard on the Code Submission Due Date
2. The poster you presented must be submitted as a **single PDF file submission** to the Turn-it-in link provided on Blackboard before the Demo Due Date

Marking Criteria

Quality of poster (30%)

The poster is well structured, uncluttered, with appropriate use of text, diagrams, pictures, and tables to best convey information to the audience. The poster is creatively presented and captures attention.

Ability to exhibit and communicate work (40%)

The verbal presentation should be interactive where possible, establishing the length and depth of information requested, and tailoring the lab appropriately. The speaker should aim to be confident, fluent, and present professionally.

Completeness (30%)

The laboratory work and indicated tasks are complete and functional or correct and/or addresses the aims of the laboratory.

See table below for the exact marking breakdown for the project.

	Poster		Presentation		Completeness	
Excellent (85-100%)	Excellent structure, uncluttered, appropriate text, diagrams, pictures, and tables best convey information. Creative presentation captures attention. Clearly defined topic and scope. Appropriate background material.	30	The verbal presentation is interactive, tailored appropriately to audience. Confident, fluent, professional presentation – no grammar errors, slang, or stumbles. Questions are handled masterfully. Professional dress and demeanour.	40	From the exposition of the work, it should be self-evident that the work is complete and functional or correct and/or addresses the needs of users. The effort required to complete the work is impressive.	30

Very Good (75-84%)	Well structured, minimal clutter, effective. Well defined topic and scope. Appropriate background material.	24	A fluent, professional presentation with considerable interaction. Able to defend and justify work. Questions are handled well. Effortlessly uses poster and/or demonstration as an aid.	32	With some explanation the work is seen to be complete. The effort is substantial.	24
Good (65-74%)	Structure and generally appropriate material convey essential message. Topic and scope defined well. Some background material.	20	A good presentation with some interaction. Able to defend and justify work. Questions are handled reasonably well. Uses poster and/or demonstration as an aid.	28	The work is near complete and mostly functional or correct.	20
Satisfactory (50-64%)	Some structure and generally appropriate material convey essential message. Good but plain presentation. Topic and scope defined. Some background material.	15	The verbal presentation is inflexible or highly scripted, but average listener copes. Stiff presentation. Uses poster and/or demonstration as an aid	20	The work, while incomplete, is close to the original goal and is generally functional. The effort is reasonable.	15
Poor (25-49%)	Inappropriate use of text, diagrams, pictures, or tables. Unstructured, cluttered, poor presentation. Poorly defined topic/scope. Little relevant background material.	10	An interested listener struggles with the presentation. Poorly prepared or delivered presentation.	12	The work falls short of completion and has very limited functionality.	10
Very Poor (0-24%)	Use of text, diagrams, pictures, and tables only confuses message. Scrappy unprofessional presentation. Work lacks academic merit. No definition of topic and scope. No relevant background material.	5	An interested listener is frustrated by the presentation. No preparation evident.	6	Little original work is evident. No outcomes are reported.	5