

600.446/646 – CIS II – Mentors Report

Dear CIS II Mentor,

First, thank you for mentoring a CIS II project this year. This course provides a great educational experience for the students, and also can produce useful research results. Its success depends greatly on the project mentors, and I hope that your experience this year has been productive both for you and for the students.

As part of our grading process this year, I am encouraging project mentors to provide some input. You all should have been granted access to the course web site and to the individual project(s) that you are mentoring. Go to

<https://ciis.lcsr.jhu.edu/doku.php?id=courses:456:2022:projects>

You will be asked to log in by clicking the login link in the upper right. You can then follow the link to your specific project. Contact either me (rht@jhu.edu) or the TA (Juan Antonio Barragan, jbarrag3@jh.edu) if you have problems.

We would really appreciate it if you can answer a few questions. Please, edit the form and send it back to your students, so that they can upload it onto the course web site for us to revise. If you have any additional private comments that you would like to share with us you can send them directly via email to me and Juan with the subject "cis ii project xxx additional feedback".

Finally, note that the annual final exam / poster session will be Thursday, May 11 from 9 AM until about 12:30 PM. This year, the event will be held in person on Hackerman B17. I very much hope that you can attend. Also, the project reports are due on the day of the poster session, but the students have been told that you need an opportunity to review the reports before then. Also, **we will need your comments to us on May 11 before 9AM**, since we will be using them to help us with our evaluation of the projects.

Russ Taylor

PS: An electronic copy of this word file may be found on the CIS 2 Wiki page at

<https://ciis.lcsr.jhu.edu/dokuwiki/doku.php?id=courses:446>

Our contact information is below:

Russ Taylor: rht@jhu.edu; cell 443-838-9729

Juan Antonio Barragan: jbarrag3@jh.edu; cell (317) 603 1817

Questionnaire – Project 18 Dual-robotic arm prostate ultrasound tomography

Overall project and progress

- Were you satisfied with the overall technical progress made in the course of the semester?
Yes. The students were struggling a little bit in the beginning mainly due to the lack of the second robot arm and had to change the deliverables. But they ended up with a good plan and execution.
- Was the total accomplishment appropriate for the number and level (undergrad/graduate) of students on the project?
Yes.
- Will the results be useful to you in the future?
Yes.
- Is this a project that you would like to continue? If so, is it left in a state to facilitate this?
Yes. Yunpu and Ziyi will continue working on the project during summer.
- Do you see a prospect for patents or publication to result?
Yes. The robotic framework is a very important cornerstone to prostate tomography imaging.

Work products

- Is the **project documentation** adequate?
Yes.
- If the project involves source code, is the code well-structured and usable by others?
Yes.
- **Important:** Are the project documentation, programs, and data preserved in a place readily accessible and identified in the project Wiki pages?
Yes.

Report (which the students should have shared with you)

- Does the project report accurately reflect the scope and accomplishment of the project?
Yes.
- Were you given an adequate opportunity to review the report?
Yes.
- Does the report and its appendices, together with the web site, provide sufficient information that subsequent groups can make effective use of the project results?
Yes.
- Does the report include clear links to project documentation, programs, and data?
Yes.

Web site

- Does the web site reflect the scope and accomplishment of the project?
Yes.
- Do you wish the web site to remain password protected after May 30? If so, for how long?
No.

Management

- Were the students fully engaged in the project?
Yes. They have a very clear separation of tasks, meanwhile most of the work was a team effort.
- How often did they meet with you? Was this enough?
They meet with Mohammad and me regularly once a week on Wednesday. They also participated in the robotic ultrasound meeting on Monday with Dr. Taylor and Dr. Bector, and sometimes joined MUSiiC group meeting on Tuesday.
- Were the “deliverables” and “dependencies” realistic?
Yes.
- Was the plan realistic? Were unmet dependencies approached in an effective manner?
Yes.

Other comments or suggestions

- Do you have any other comments or suggestions, either about the specific project or about the overall structure of the course for next year.
Not specifically.