

No	Group	Submission and contents of progress reports			Final Report and Presentation (Evaluation)				comments	Total Project Mark	Weight	Student Project Mark
		No Of Students	Submissions	Comments on progress reports	Progress Report Weight	Technical Content	Completeness	Innovation				
1	270257 270269 906810	3	30-Mar 13-Apr 5-May	Reports are almost identical with zero increment till the final report	2	8	6	1	Reproduction is OK - code is not rewritten - many items are missing for a team of 3 - no new ideas explored	17	1 0.8 1	17 13.6 17
2	260308	1	31-Mar 14-Apr 5-May	First two reports contain restatement of the problem (like a paper) - Third report contains one figure	3	7	7	2	Some reproduced figures not OK - implemented proposed algorithm - sited related work - explained genetic algorithm approach - relatively good for a team of one	19	1	19
3	260424	1	31-Mar 13-Apr 25-May	Excellent progress with clear effort and progress with time	4	9	6	6	Technically solid work with new approaches explored	25	1	25
4	207036	1	30-Mar 13-Apr 11-May	Submitted all reports - final progress report contains paper skeleton - yet no results	4	7	6	2	Work not complete - results need to be averaged and explained - concept not very novel - needs more work	19	1	19
5	237489 234907	2	1-Apr	only first one-page report containing few sentences describing problem	1	0	0	0	Team did not submit progress report nor showed any evidence of work - one member withdrawn	1	1 1	1 1
6	260462 260276 270417	3	13-Apr 20-May 25-May	Reports show partial progress no proportional to strength of group last two reports part of final report	3	6	5	1	Text in Genetic Algorithms section take from paper at http://www.springerlink.com/content/4y72a47qpp4nn8rp/ - Some reproduced figures do not match originals - Work not sufficient at ALL for team of 3 (1 is Ph.D.)	15	1 1 1	15 15 15
7	984821	1	30-Mar 24-May 31-May 1-Jun	Very little effort in project - almost no progress till last two weeks of semester - progress reports sent after deadline	2	7	6	1	Did not implement proposed algorithm - No rewriting of code - Shallow description of use of genetic algorithms for OFDMA scheduling - Very little effort put in project	16	1	16
8	270243	1	31-Mar 18-May	Did not send all reports - but showed serious effort in rewriting and understanding the code	3	8	6	2	Under estimated required effort - did not reproduce all figures - trapped in code details and the event of "outage". However, thorough understanding and rewriting of code	19	1	19
9	270149	1	30-Mar 16-Apr 25-May	Showed good progress and followup with instructor	4	8	8	4	Good understanding of problem - implemented proposed algorithm - excellent survey of use of genetic search method (no implementation though)	24	1	24
10	224056 225652	2	30-Mar	Only first progress report - some meetings based on instructor request	3	8	7	4	Good reproduction of figures with implementation of proposed algorithm - comparison with other methods - Touched on usage of non-shannon based capacity - explored uplink scheduling with some depth - A team of two could do a bit more	22	1 1	22 22
11	217197	1			3	7	7	3	Did not reproduce figures - implemented proposed algorithm - Good coverage of use of genetic algorithms	20	1	20
12	270271	1			3	6	6	1	Did not reproduce figures - good understanding of code - not sufficient work for student	16	1	16