

(2) 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](#).

Record of Independent Marking and Feedback for M Valchev by DE Millard

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 well planned and executed project. Evidence of early risk planning, and time planning via a comparative gantt chart. Personal reflections are a little brief.	F	E	D	C	B	A	A+	A*
T	Technical Approach Outstanding technical approach. Considered, thoughtful analysis of the problem, all done within the context of the problem. Multiple methods used. Well designed architecture, and appealing and useable front end.	F	E	D	C	B	A	A+	A*
E	Testing and Evaluation Evidence of white box testing during development (although would have been good to see the direct evidence of this). Evaluation of the performance is extremely thorough, and conclusions are evidenced well. Although its not clear how well the static dataset would have performed with fewer annotated samples. It would also have been good to set out some performance goals (for example, what is good enough in different scenarios).	F	E	D	C	B	A	A+	A*
A	Achievement Detailed and meticulous experimental work, convincing results that are likely publishable in the social media analysis field.	F	E	D	C	B	A	A+	A*
W	Main Report Beautifully written and well structured report. Maybe lacking in some of the highest level explanatory detail, but otherwise explains the project very clearly. Wide range of high quality sources, used critically to justify the work undertaken.	F	E	D	C	B	A	A+	A*
U	Knowledge and Understanding Excellent knowledge, answered questions well.	F	E	D	C	B	A	A+	A*
Comments on Project as a Whole									
An outstanding project. Notable for its technical detail and careful use of machine learning techniques within the context of a real world problem. Extremely well engineered. Research element is convincing and worthy of publication. Extraordinary - well done!									
Mark awarded by DE Millard							85 %		

Record of Moderation Procedure

Mark awarded by DE Millard	85 % (from above)
Mark awarded by OF Bills	80 % (other examiner)
Difference	5 % (<i>usually > 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:	83 % Agreed Mark
<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.

Agreed Third Examiner
<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

Clearly an excellent project, our marks were close so agreed to average and round up.

DE Millard

Signed:

Date: