

CMP040X301Y BSc Project Independent Marking Criteria

Student Name	Tyler Stephen Supersad
Student ID	SUP20486969
Project Title	Deepfake Detective
Programme	BSc Computer Science
Supervisor	Dr Charles Clarke

Grading Criteria

Criteria	Excellent	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory
Self-manage a significant piece of individual work using appropriate project management techniques.	Attended all meetings with supervisor in a well-prepared manner, and gradually took the lead in the meeting.	Attended most meetings with the supervisor in a well-prepared manner, occasionally took the lead in the meeting.	Attendance and preparedness for meetings was poor strong lead by the supervisor throughout.
	Kept and evidenced high quality documentation including a log of all supervisory meetings and their agreed outcomes.	Kept and evidenced documentation and log of most supervisory meetings and their agreed outcomes.	Little evidence documentation and log of supervisory meetings and agreed outcomes.
	Developed a high-quality plan of work from the outset and self-monitored progress, adapting and planning to suit changes in scope and requirements.	Developed a plan of work and generally monitored progress throughout the progress, updating the plan as required.	Only a minimal plan developed and rarely updated to meet changing scope and requirements.
	Showed clear initiative and organisational independence in the management of the project.	Occasionally showed initiative and organisational independence in the management of the project.	Rarely showed initiative and organisational independence in the management of the project.
	Clearly demonstrated the ability to respond to advice regarding the organisation of the project.	Would often demonstrate the ability to respond to advice regarding the organisation of the project.	Would rarely respond to advice regarding the organisation of the project.
Synthesise information, ideas, and practices to define a quality solution to a problem.	Undertook a very demanding problem given previous experience and domain of study.	Undertook a reasonably demanding given previous experience and domain of study.	Problem undertaken was not very demanding given previous experience and domain of study.
	Problem defined is focused and clearly understood.	Problem could be better defined and is not completely understood.	Problem is not well defined and is not well understood.
	High-quality investigation has been undertaken and evidenced into the problem context.	Good investigation has been undertaken with suitable evidence into the problem context.	Minimal investigation undertaken with little evidence into the problem context.

	Clear evidence of reading and investigation around the problem area, such as other products and other methodologies.	Some evidence of reading and investigating around the problem area, maybe including alternative products and methodologies.	Little evidence of reading and investigating around the problem area, with little consideration of alternative products/methods.
	An excellent range of literature and/or technology has been reviewed.	A good range of literature and/or technology has been reviewed.	Little literature and/or technology has been reviewed.
	Excellent critical appraisal of the literature and/or technology reviewed.	Good critical appraisal of the literature and/or technology reviewed.	Little critical appraisal of the literature and/or technology reviewed.
	Clear evidence of an understanding of the underlying principles behind the problem.	Some evidence of some understanding of the underlying principles behind the problem.	Little evidence of an understanding of the underlying principles behind the problem.
	The investigation clearly informs the actual work undertaken within the project to solve the problem.	The investigation somewhat informs the actual work undertaken within the project to solve the problem.	Little evidence that the investigation was used to inform the work undertaken to solve the problem.

Apply practical and analytical skills present in computer science as a whole.	The product delivered involved creation and/or mastery of something new to the student.	The product delivered involved creation and/or mastery of some new ideas to the student.	The product delivered could be achieved without extending taught techniques/knowledge.
	Clear evidence of the outcomes and deliverables being evaluated against the initial project aims and work of others.	Some evidence of the outcomes and deliverables being evaluated against the initial project aims and work of others.	Little evidence of the outcomes and deliverables being evaluated against the initial project aims and work of others.
	Clear evidence of having assessed alternative approaches to solving problems and making sound decisions on how to proceed.	Some evidence of having assessed alternative approaches to solving problems and making generally reasonable decisions on how to proceed.	Little to no evidence of having assessed alternative approaches to solving problems.
	Clear evidence of ability to benefit from technical advice and choosing to backtrack to produce a better solution.	Some evidence of ability to benefit from technical advice and maybe choosing to backtrack to produce a better solution.	Little to no evidence of ability to benefit from technical advice and choosing to backtrack to produce a better-quality solution.
	Clear evidence of self-reliance and resourcefulness in solving technical problems demonstrated by seeking of technical information, understanding, then applying it.	Some evidence of self-reliance and resourcefulness in solving technical problems demonstrated by seeking of technical information, understanding it, and then generally applying it.	Little evidence of self-reliance and resourcefulness in solving technical problems with little to no demonstration of seeking technical information, understanding it, and applying it.

Produce a project deliverable that meets a real need in a wider context.	Product delivered is of professional quality.	Product delivered is of a somewhat professional quality.	Product delivered is not of a professional quality.
	Product has successfully met the original aims of the project.	Product has successfully met most of the original aims of the project.	Product has only successfully met a few or none of the original aims of the project.
	The product developed is of significant scope and complexity given the degree of study.	The product developed is of a satisfactory scope and complexity given the degree of study.	The product developed is of an unsatisfactory scope and complexity given the degree of study.
	The internal elegance/engineering/quality of the product delivered is high.	The internal elegance/engineering/quality of the product delivered is satisfactory.	The internal elegance/engineering/quality of the product delivered is not satisfactory.

Critical self-evaluation of the overall project process and deliverables.	Clear reflection on the project process, demonstrating achievements in overcoming issues faced during the project lifetime.	Some reflection on the project process, with some demonstration of achievements in overcoming issues faced during the project lifetime.	Little evidence of reflection on the project process, with little to no evidence of achievements in overcoming issues faced during the project lifetime.
	Clear evidence of what would have been done differently with hindsight.	Some evidence of what would have been done differently with hindsight.	Little evidence of what would have been done differently with hindsight.
	Clear description of relevant future work which could be undertaken with the project.	Some relevant future work directions of the project described.	Little to no future work directions described.

Recognise the legal, social, ethical, and professional issues relevant to a project.	Clear evidence of understanding of any legal issues related to the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report.	Some evidence of understanding of any legal issues related to the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report.	Little to no evidence of understanding of any legal issues related to the project.
	Clear evidence of understanding of any social issues related to the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report.	Some evidence of understanding of any social issues related to the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report.	Little to no evidence of understanding of any social issues related to the project.
	Clear evidence of understanding of any ethical issues related to the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report and suitable ethical clearance being sought and granted.	Some evidence of understanding of any ethical issues related to the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report and suitable ethical clearance being sought and granted.	Little to no evidence of understanding of any ethical issues related to the project.
	Clear evidence of understanding of the professional aspects of the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report.	Some evidence of understanding of the professional aspects of the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report.	Little to no evidence of understanding of any professional issues related to the project.

Produce a report that describes and summarises the entire project deliverable and process, including evaluation.	Report conforms to standards regarding the quality and format of presentation, including correct usage of project report template.	Report mostly conforms to standards regarding the quality and format of presentation, and generally uses the project report template.	Report poorly conforms to standards regarding quality and format of presentation, and generally does not use project report template.
	Excellent quality of written expression, clearly conveying the work done using appropriate technical language.	Good quality of written expression, and generally conveys the work done using appropriate technical language.	Poor quality of written expression and doesn't really convey the work done in suitably technical language.
	Fully appreciates the academic context of the work undertaken as evidenced by the scope and depth of the literature review.	Appreciates the academic context of the work undertaken as evidenced by the reasonable scope and depth of the literature review.	Little appreciation for the academic context of the work undertaken demonstrated by the limited scope and depth of the literature review.
	Demonstrated clear independence and resourcefulness in the conduct of the academic production of the work.	Demonstrated general independence and resourcefulness in the conduct of the academic production of the work.	Little demonstration of independence and resourcefulness in the conduct of the academic production of the work.
	Clearly demonstrates analytical thought as demonstrated by high-quality argumentation, weighing of evidence, succinct summarisation, enlightened commentaries, and the making of novel connections.	Demonstrates some analytical thought as demonstrated either through argumentation, weighing of evidence, summarisation, commentary, or the making of novel connections.	Little demonstration of analytical thought with little to no evidence of argumentation, weighing of evidence, summarisation, commentary, or the making of novel connections.
	High-quality self-appraisal as evidenced in the summing up, comparing achievements to aims, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the work, comparison to the state-of-the-art, and areas of future work.	Good self-appraisal with evidence of summing up, comparing achievement to aims, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the work, comparison to the state-of-the-art, or defining areas of future work.	Little self-appraisal with little to no evidence of summing up, comparing achievements to aims, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the work, comparison to the state-of-the-art, or areas of future work.
TOTAL	32	3	0

Individual Feedback

The project is challenged for undergraduate. The student did an excellent work on this project.

The motivation is good presented, models are carefully selected with comparison discussion. The dataset is well analyzed, experiments are properly conducted and evaluated.

Very good work has been done, students claimed that different parameters for the models have been tested during experiments but didn't included in report. It will be more promising by play with the models with more testing output.

A lot of interesting work is done, good work!

Grade

Please tick the grade you believe should be given to the project. See the grading guidance for help on how to arrive at this grade.

100	92	85	82	78	75	72	68	65	62	58	55	52	48	45	42	38	35	25	15	5	0
					x																

Staff Name	WEI LI
Staff Signature	Wei Li
Role in Project	Second Marker