

# (1) PIII Project Project Assessment and Feedback Form Assessment Form 2021

**Student** Martin Valchev <mv1u18> **Examiner1** OF Bills <ob1a12>  
**Examiner2** DE Millard <dem>  
**Title** Analysis and Application of Active Learning to Classify Malicious Twitter Posts

Your project student has submitted a [Final Project Report](#) in response to the instructions given in the [detailed project guidelines](#).

## Academic Integrity

"Similarity Index" returned by the TurnItIn plagiarism check: Where the similarity index is >10%, you should discuss the nature of any similarities in the comments box below.	2 % Similarity
If the similarity index is >10%, or the examiner has other Academic Integrity concerns, they must confirm that they have reviewed the TurnItIn report, discussed the matter with the Academic Integrity Officer and, if necessary, alerted the project coordinator:	<input type="checkbox"/> Academic Integrity Officer Consulted
Comments on Academic Integrity	

## Record of Independent Marking and Feedback for M Valchev by OF Bills

Each project is marked independently by two examiners. Please use the following grid to record your independent marking before proceeding to the [moderation section](#) below it.

Independent marking process

1. Assign a letter grade in each of **Categories** based on **Typical attributes** from the [project marking scheme](#) and record the results in the appropriate location within the grid below.
2. Add a comment for each category. Comments should be typed or written legibly and should convey to another examiner the reasons for the allocated grade.
3. Use the distribution of letter grades to help determine the **Range** in which the final mark should fall. Please make sure that a prizeworthy project scores consistently high on all attributes. In particular a prizeworthy report should be (almost) free from spelling and grammatical errors.
4. Finally assign a mark out of 100 and fill in additional comments on the project as a whole. Here you may wish to comment on the relative importance of the different categories in your assessment.

Cat.	Comments and Feedback	Grades							
		Fail	3rd	2.2	2.1	First			
P	Progress Report (pre-marked by the supervisor: A)	F	E	D	C	B	A	A+	A*
M	Project Management  Very good project management throughout - clear deadlines and tasks in conjunction with appropriate tools and a sensible overall project plan, adjusted to meet needs as things changed. Student worked well throughout.	F	E	D	C	B	A	A+	A*
T	Technical Approach  A very good technical approach taken - a great usage of appropriate tools, libraries and techniques following a strong design leading to an even stronger implementation and the creation of a very useful platform that can hopefully be used again in the future.	F	E	D	C	B	A	A+	A*
E	Testing and Evaluation  Strong automated testing to ensure the application was working correctly. Evaluation was the weakest part of the project - it would have been good to show more on the benefits of the approach and putting numbers to it and really making a case for the approach used and what was found, especially in comparison to other approaches.	F	E	D	C	B	A	A+	A*
A	Achievement  Amazing achievement - the student started off without any knowledge in any of the technologies used and ended up producing a tool that is polished and immediately usable for all manner of general problems and gained an amazing level of understanding through everything they did.	F	E	D	C	B	A	A+	A*
W	Main Report  A very well written, structured report that is clear, concise and a joy to read. A thorough literature review and very good and broad selection of references.	F	E	D	C	B	A	A+	A*
U	Knowledge and Understanding  A very good level of knowledge and understanding shown throughout the report, demonstration and viva. The fact the student went from a point of knowing nothing on the subject matter to where they are now is doubly impressive.	F	E	D	C	B	A	A+	A*
Comments on Project as a Whole									
Overall an incredibly good project - very well written, demonstrated and explained to produce something that could be immediately usable and a platform for future development. Very well done!									
Mark awarded by OF Bills						80 %			

## Record of Moderation Procedure

Mark awarded by OF Bills	80 % (from above)
Mark awarded by DE Millard	85 % (other examiner)
Difference	5 % ( <i>usually &gt; 0</i> )

During moderation the examiners attempt to arrive at a final mark for the project.

Please select one of the following options

<input type="radio"/> We have discussed the marks and compromised on a mark of:	<b>83 % Agreed Mark</b>
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Our marks differ by 6% or less and we have taken an average mark:	
<input type="radio"/> We have discussed the marks but have not reached a compromise AND the difference between our marks is more than 6%.	

Where no agreement is reached and the marks differ by more than 6%, the examiners must propose and agree on a third examiner. A third examiner is also required to confirm any failing (<40%) or prizeworthy (>85%) project mark.

<b>Agreed Third Examiner</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> Although we have arrived at a mark which is neither failing nor prizeworthy, we would like a third examiner to look at the work.

Where a third examiner is required, the supervisor:

1. Makes sure that the third examiner accepts the task
2. Provides the third examiner with a paper copy of the final report
3. Notifies the project coordinator

## Comments on Moderation

We both agreed this was a mark in the 80-85 and agreed on 83 as the average which we both believe accurately reflected the achievement in this project.

OF Bills

Signed:

Date: