

Maurice Ling <mauriceling@gmail.com>

Comments on my project supervision

Bryan Keng bryankeng1996@gmail.com>
To: mauriceling@acm.org

Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 10:28 PM

Hi maurice,

What's good/what I liked:

Very flexible in terms of our work schedule as well as meeting places and times.

Understanding when we work slowly due to other commitments like CCA, exams etc.

Approachable and friendly - asking questions on gmail, treating us as peers.

Patient and thorough during explanations, even when we're blur and ask the same thing twice.

Giving us room to explore with new ideas although we sometimes screw up.

What's not so good:

I can't think of anything in particular. I guess I would prefer to have learnt more about coding, but that's kinda our own fault.

On Sun, Jan 11, 2015 at 10:15 PM, Maurice Ling <mauriceling@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi guys

We have effectively closed the entire project and it has been 3.5 years since I last asked this; so, I will like to hear your truthful views on my project supervision and coaching for my own improvement.

These are some questions to guide you:

- 1. What's good?
- 2. What's bad?
- 3. What you like?
- 4. What you prefer to have?

Don't worry, just tell me the truth - Separate emails OK...

Thanks.

Maurice LING

mobile: +6596669233

www: http://maurice.vodien.com

CV: http://maurice.vodien.com/maurice_resume.pdf Linkedin: http://www.linkedin.com/in/mauriceling

ResearchGate: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Maurice_HT_Ling

1 of 1 25/06/15 8:28 PM



Maurice Ling <mauriceling@gmail.com>

Comments on my project supervision

Oliver Chan hamsternator.oliver@gmail.com>
To: mauriceling@acm.org

Sun, Jan 18, 2015 at 7:42 PM

Hi Maurice I can't believe I forgot this - I was planning to do it on Tuesday night then I forgot.

I think that having a mentor who's willing to meet practically every week/2 weeks is very good, because it gives more face time and chances to learn/clarify. Face-to-face is usually most effective when clarifying doubts/concepts with a mentor. I also think that the system of we-write-then-you-edit is pretty good because it lets us see directly where our report-writing skills are substandard and how it would be properly written in a professional scientific report. It also ensures that we don't let slip any nonsense into the final report. Lastly I think that us being able to contact you informally over gmail or text to clarify small problems at most hours of the day is good, because sometimes we're stumped by a minor problem, but can fix it by checking with you.

I thought the last project (CUB) was not so good in that I was constantly confused on what the project was trying to achieve. Maybe it was because it was a bit rushed, or that I was not focused on this at that time. I honestly thought that you did most if not all of the work in that one. At most, we just followed instructions. But ultimately it got published so well I guess it's ok.

Once again thanks for mentoring us these couple of past years! It's been very good and I thoroughly liked it.

Oliver

On Sun, Jan 11, 2015 at 10:15 PM, Maurice Ling <mauriceling@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi guys

We have effectively closed the entire project and it has been 3.5 years since I last asked this; so, I will like to hear your truthful views on my project supervision and coaching for my own improvement.

These are some questions to guide you:

- 1. What's good?
- 2. What's bad?
- 3. What you like?
- 4. What you prefer to have?

Don't worry, just tell me the truth - Separate emails OK...

Thanks.

Maurice LING

mobile: +6596669233

www: http://maurice.vodien.com

CV: http://maurice.vodien.com/maurice_resume.pdf Linkedin: http://www.linkedin.com/in/mauriceling

ResearchGate: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Maurice HT Ling

1 of 1 25/06/15 8:29 PM