

COMP 492 Assignment 7: Final Project Report

This assignment is in two parts: Part A (25%) consists of a relatively short document (0.5–2 pages) describing the actions you took to implement the comments on the previous draft of the project report, and any other changes you chose to make; Part B (75%) consists of the final version of the project report itself—that is, the document that implements the actions described in Part A.

Part A: Description of changes (25%)

As already mentioned, this part of the assignment consists of a document describing how you have changed the previous draft of your project report. It is essential that any substantive comments made by the instructor and/or thesis committee members on the previous draft are addressed. (The instructor and/or thesis committee members are referred to as the *reviewers* in the remainder of this document.) The best way to do this is to list excerpts from the reviewers' comments, coupled with the resulting action you took. Here is a fictitious example:

- “inconsistent capitalization of the word ‘Java’” -- found and corrected 6 instances of “java” in lowercase
- “several of the requirements are too vague” -- rewrote requirements 1.3, 2.1 and 2.4 using more specific language
- “introduction does not give enough background information about the Wombat programming language” -- added a new section (Section 1.1, pages 2-3) describing Wombat, incorporating several paragraphs of description and several simple examples of Wombat code
- “the design of your Marsupial widget seems inefficient. Can this be reformulated using a quadratic algorithm, rather than the exponential cost of the present design?” -- I believe this can be reformulated to be more efficient, but as this change would have required a significant rewrite of the code, so it has not been implemented. Instead, a paragraph in the Future Work section discusses the potential for reformulation.
- “spelling of Platipus is incorrect” -- I respectfully disagree with the reviewer; the software package I am using includes a Platipus class which is deliberately spelt differently to the English word platypus; therefore, in order to maintain consistency with the existing package, this change has not been implemented.

As you can see from the above example, it is not necessary to implement every change recommended by the reviewers. You can, instead, explain why the change is not necessary. However, your Part A document must address every recommended change.

In addition, you should describe any other changes you have made (i.e. changes that were not specifically recommended by the reviewers). Continuing with our fictitious example, your Part A document might include the following:

- rewrote the second half of the Results section to reflect the experimental data produced in the last two weeks
- added a paragraph in the Conclusion describing an alternative approach to this problem

The suggested length for the Part A document is 0.5-2 pages, preferably in the bullet point format of the above examples. Any reasonable spacing and font size may be used. The grading of this document will be based on the comprehensiveness of the implemented changes and the clarity of the explanations given.

Part B: Final version of project report (75%)

This part of the assignment consists of a professional-quality report describing your senior project. The specific requirements for the report are identical to the previous draft (Assignment 4), with the following exceptions.

- You are expected to have improved the previous draft by implementing some or all of the reviewers' suggestions and also making your own independent improvements.
- Whether or not you achieved all of the original goals of the project, your project is now, by definition, complete. Your report should therefore provide convincing evidence that your completed work comprises a substantial, useful, and meaningful body of research or engineering effort. (You should probably still have a Future Work section, describing further activities that could amplify the project if you or someone else were to continue working on it.)

The criteria for grading are also identical to the previous draft (please see the rubric provided with Assignment 4), with the following exceptions.

- Additional weight will be given to the quality and correctness of the implemented changes to the previous draft.
- In assessing the overall scientific or engineering merit of the project, additional weight will be given to whether the project has been completed satisfactorily. (As already stated above, this does not necessarily mean you must have met all of your original goals. Rather, the report must convincingly argue that your achievements constitute a complete piece of research or software.)

Important note

Even if the reviewers did not recommend substantial changes to the previous draft, you are expected to significantly enhance your previous draft in some way. This might consist of rewriting or amplifying one or more of the weaker sections, and/or adding a few pages of new material.

Submission

Please submit two separate documents to Moodle by the deadline—one for Part A, and one for Part B. Use an obvious naming scheme for your files, such as `yourname-partA.pdf` and `yourname-partB.pdf`. Any easily-read file types are acceptable, including PDF, Microsoft Word, and OpenOffice.