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| **University of Chester -** Postgraduate Assignment Feedback    **Department of Computer Science** | | | | |
| Module No  CO7100 | | Module Title  Research Dissertation | Academic Year | Assessment No |
| Student identifier | | Student name  Abdelrahman Abdelwahab | Submission date  October 2023 | **Agreed Mark**  70% |
| Title of Assignment  Dissertation Report | | | | |
|  | *All marks are provisional pending approval by the Awards Assessment Board* | | | |

**First Marker:\_\_\_\_HS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Section | Comments (based on L7 marking criteria) | **Marks** |
| Writing, structuring, grammar, spelling of the report Mostly well structured report, with all the required sections used appropriately.  Some errors in grammar, word choice etc., consistent with English not being the student’s first language, but student has made an effort to improve English writing skills during the course, and meaning is generally clear. Very good effort. | *Distinction (>70%)*  A high degree of skill. The academic form shows exceptional standards of presentation or delivery.  *Merit: (60-69%)*  Observes appropriate academic form. Fluent & persuasive.  *Pass: (50-59%)*  Predominantly accurate in spelling and grammar. Ideas communicated appropriately and satisfactorily.  *Higher Fail: (30-49%)*  Recurring errors in spelling and grammar. Ideas limited and underdeveloped; possibly poor paraphrasing;  *Lower Fail: (<30%)*  Severe deficiencies in spelling, grammar and expression undermine meaning; possibly poor paraphrasing | 7/10 |
| Literature, context, related work, references Substantial amount of relevant litertature on a wide range of relevant topics consulted, incorporated and referenced. | *Distinction (>70%)*  A high degree of engagement with research and/or practice pertaining to field(s) and disciplines of study. Substantial range and sophisticated use of sources.  *Merit: (60-69%)*  Sustained engagement with research and/or practice pertaining to field(s) and disciplines of study. An assured range of reading, with sustained reference to key and core texts. Very good referencing in breadth and/or depth, which shows a very good level of intellectual rigor.  *Pass: (50-59%)*  Engagement with relevant knowledge pertaining to discipline and key issues. A satisfactory range of core and basic texts, referencing current research in the discipline  *Higher Fail: (30-49%)*  Unsatisfactory engagement with / insufficient understanding of relevant knowledge pertaining to discipline and key  Issues. Insufficient range of source reading from core and basic texts. Sources not acknowledged in line with academic conventions of referencing.  *Lower Fail: (<30%)*  Inadequate coverage of relevant issues. Inconsistent understanding shown, with inaccurate or missing knowledge. Reading material inadequate and may not cover core or basic texts. Inaccurate, limited or missing referencing. | 17/25 |
| Intellectual performance, originality and independence Tackles a complex topic which is essential for study by CS researchers, but inevitably overlaps with other subject domains. Describes the multi-disciplinary nature of the topic, and explains focus on UX rather than sociology.  Evidence of substantial effort to create and test a prototype solution to a real problem, using industry standard approaches. | *Distinction (>70%)*  A high degree of analysis and evaluation;  A sustained argument with the possibility for new insights.  *Merit: (60-69%)*  A developed conceptual understanding that enables the student to find new meanings in established hypotheses.  A developed and sustained argument with the possibility for new.  *Pass: (50-59%)*  Able to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively. Able to devise a coherent critical/ analytical argument which is supported with evidence.  *Higher Fail: (30-49%)*  Does not show ability to deal with complex issues.  Judgements not substantiated. Weak interpretation of research, showing lack of understanding and / or lack of supporting evidence.  *Lower Fail: (<30%)*  Very weak analysis, possibly limited to a single perspective. Episodes of self-contradiction or confusion | 20/30 |
| Engineering, professionalism/ choice of methodology Good effort to apply industry-standard approaches to an important topic | *Distinction (>70%)*  Excellent interpretation, application and evaluation of the possibilities and limitations of the methodologies used by  the student and key scholars/ practitioners pertaining to the field(s) of study.  Methods used may offer new insights or contributions to knowledge. Very high professional and/or personal standards of engagement and conduct throughout.  *Merit: (60-69%)*  A comprehensive understanding shown and a  sustained application of established methodologies and methods applicable to the student’s own research.  Research work planned in scale and scope so that robust  and appropriate evidence can be gathered and articulated.  Good professional and/or personal standards of engagement and conduct throughout.  *Pass: (50-59%)*  A satisfactory application of research techniques and  enquiry that are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline. Research work planned systematically in scale and scope so that appropriate evidence can be gathered. Satisfactory professional and/or personal standards of engagement and conduct throughout.  *Higher Fail: (30-49%)*  Unsatisfactory application of research techniques pertaining to the discipline. Unsatisfactory research undertaken, resulting in underdeveloped and poorly executed work. Unsatisfactory professional and/or personal standards of engagement and conduct.  *Lower Fail: (<30%)*  Very weak understanding of established methodologies and those used by student.  Substandard research, with inappropriate choice of methods.  Substandard professional and/or personal standards of  engagement and conduct. | 17/25 |
| Usefulness of results and findings The background information, prototype and test results collected would form a useful basis for a future M.Sc. student to build on. | *Distinction (>70%)*  Report as submitted meets the standards required for academic publication, in terms of content and originality, as well as presentation.  The program, design or other solution produced is ready to be applied successfully to a real problem, and complies with all relevant standards.  *Merit: (60-69%)*  Report as submitted is close to the standards required for academic publication, in terms of content and originality, as well as presentation.  The program, design or other solution produced is close to being ready to be applied successfully to a real problem, and meets (or is very close to meeting) all relevant standards  *Pass: (50-59%)*  The report demonstrates the student’s ability to replicate and extend existing published work, or to apply theory to a real problem.  Parts of the program, design or other solution produced are close to being ready to be applied to a real problem, and all relevant standards have been taken into account.  *Higher Fail: (30-49%)*  The report may demonstrate the student’s intention to replicate and extend existing published work, or apply theory to a real problem, but this has not been done successfully.  Most of the program, design or other solution produced are not ready to be applied to a real problem.  Relevant standards may have been referred to, but have been applied incorrectly, incompletely or inconsistently.  *Lower Fail: (<30%)*  Little attempt shown to replicate or extend existing published work, or apply theory to a real problem.  The program, design or other solution produced does not relate in scope or content to a realistic problem, and / or the implementation does not prove anything useful in a realistic context.  Relevant standards have not referred to at all. | 7/10 |
|  |  |  |
| First/Second Marker’s Overall Mark (%) |  | 68% |