MTP3 Detailed Evaluation

Student Name:	Student Roll Number: ....
Filled by (please sign):	Date ....

- S=Student, G=Guide
- If a question is not applicable, leave the row blank

	Yes	Neutral	No
MTP category (check one or more)			
Theoretical computer science	O	O	O
Algorithm design and experiments for computer infrastructure and applications	O	O	O
Building software or multidisciplinary systems, tools, interfaces	O	O	O
Interaction style			
S was provided a clear road map by G at the very beginning	O	O	O
G and S developed the road map collaboratively during the MTP tenure	O	O	O
S proposed a problem which grew into his/her MTP	O	O	O
S communicated insights that G had not thought about on his/her own	O	O	O
S met G or provided updates regularly, accounted for time spent, and made steady progress	O	O	O
Theoretical work evaluation			
S read and understood nontrivial theory papers	O	O	O
S designed creative examples that improved and extended G's understanding	O	O	O
S gave new but simpler or more elegant proofs of known results	O	O	O
S proved a new result that G finds nontrivial	O	O	O
Systems work evaluation			
S fixed bugs in or otherwise substantially enhanced existing code	O	O	O
G proposed problem/s and S proposed successful heuristics	O	O	O
S identified issues affecting system effectiveness and took leadership in proposing solutions	O	O	O
S developed a substantial body of new, useful code beyond what was inherited from predecessors	O	O	O
Experimental work evaluation			
S competently ran experiments and collected measurements as instructed by G	O	O	O
S internalized the game plan and came up independently with experiments and measurements	O	O	O
G completely trusts the experimental numbers produced by S	O	O	O
S drew abstract conclusions rather than just present raw data collected from experiments	O	O	O
G is confident that G or another student can replicate the results and defend them	O	O	O
Software or multidisciplinary system evaluation			
S chose the best tools from existing software to do something interesting and useful	O	O	O
S took a leadership position in architecting or greatly reorganizing the system	O	O	O
The software artifact is general and extensible (as against specific and inflexible)	O	O	O
S followed industry grade coding and testing standards	O	O	O
S provided ample high-quality documentation for the next generation of contributors	O	O	O
Report			
S did adequate review of related work and internalized them	O	O	O
The report has a natural what-why-how flow and no use-before-def bugs	O	O	O
The major bulk of the report is based on work done primarily by S	O	O	O
The report became presentable within one or few rounds of edits	O	O	O
The report is approachable by a CSE undergrad and yet has adequate technical depth	O	O	O
Talk and question answering			
The motivation was clear to S and the approaches well-defended	O	O	O
S internalized the material and answered questions and challenges confidently	O	O	O
S gave a clear talk of appropriate length which was clearly well-rehearsed	O	O	O
There was value in attending the talk beyond reading the report or paper	O	O	O
External recognition			
Paper/s accepted to a high-quality conference or journal based on work done primarily by S	O	O	O
Paper/s already submitted to a high-quality conference or journal based on ...	O	O	O
Paper/s likely to be submitted to a high-quality conference or journal based on ...	O	O	O
Solid, reusable, documented code that contributes to G's research agenda and infrastructure	O	O	O

Other comments

Comments and Instructions

- One copy of the form is to be completed by the guide, during and after the viva.

- Another copy has to be completed by the student as a self-assessment after the viva, without consulting the guide.

- Please answer all applicable questions. There is some designed redundancy, contradiction, and gradation across questions.

- In case of a graded sequence of questions, check all subsumed statements. E.g., if an athlete ran at 80 miles per hour, agree with both "the athlete ran at least as fast as 40 miles per hour" and "the athlete ran at least as fast as 70 miles per hour".

- There is no scheme for mapping the choices in the form to a grade or mark range. But, loosely speaking, AA is reserved for students that achieve external recognition, seriously impress the guide, or substantially extend the guides research and development agenda.

- If one credit of coursework is the same currency as one credit of MTP, we would expect the grade distribution for MTP to be about the same as for typical graduate courses.

- Filled out forms will be accessible to the guide, the student, and DPGC. Aggregated information will be available to all faculty and graduate students.

MTP1 Detailed Evaluation

Student Name:	Student Roll Number: ....
Filled by (please sign):	Date ....

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
● S=Student, G=Guide ● If a question is not applicable, leave the row blank			
Background and preparation			
G clearly stated the area of work and prerequisites	O	O	O
S has already taken courses which will prepare S to take on the MTP work	O	O	O
S will take courses that will help with the MTP work	O	O	O
Literature search			
S read and understood papers from a list completely specified by G	O	O	O
G gave S a general idea of the field and S discovered most references independently	O	O	O
G gave S an area and some important papers and S found more papers known to G	O	O	O
G gave S some important papers and S found more papers hitherto unknown to G	O	O	O
S read and understood some papers that did not eventually help with the proposed project	O	O	O
Software and tool familiarization (if applicable)			
S compiled, ran, stepped through, and mapped the codebase that S will work with	O	O	O
S independently found new tools and packages that will help in the proposed project	O	O	O
Reading and explaining skills			
G and S met regularly to discuss papers and projects	O	O	O
S understood the papers when discussed and explained by G	O	O	O
S was self-sufficient in reading and clearly understood the papers	O	O	O
S could come up with valid criticism of papers independently	O	O	O
G saved time and/or gained insight by hearing descriptions of papers from S	O	O	O
S constructed creative examples to illustrate concepts better than the source papers	O	O	O
Formulating a proposal	O	O	O
S appreciated limitation in prior art when revealed and explained by G	O	O	O
S independently came up with shortcomings in existing papers that are promising to pursue	O	O	O
S gave valid criticism to proposals put forth by G	O	O	O
There is a sound plan of action for the next year	O	O	O
Report			
Basic format, citations, language, organization are acceptable	O	O	O
The report is a reasonable summary of individual papers	O	O	O
There is substantial value in reading the report over and above the individual papers discussed	O	O	O
Talk and question answering			
S can motivate the research area and defend the proposed approaches	O	O	O
S internalized the material and answered questions and challenges confidently	O	O	O
S gave a clear, well-rehearsed talk of appropriate length and detail to any CSE undergrad	O	O	O
S included some material for specialist appeal after setting up stage	O	O	O

Other comments