School of Computing and Mathematical Science

Division of Computing

Honours Project marks

Experiment/case study style project

Student: Colonel Mustard (77%)

Supervisor: Richard Foley

Second marker: Peter Harper

Honours year: 2006/2007   **Date of report marking: __ /6/07____**

Agreed summary of marks

Interim report	**mark out of 20**	_____
Honours report	**mark out of 65**	____50/65 = 77%_____
Presentation	**mark out of 15**	_____

Total mark out of 100   _____

Signed (Supervisor)   _____

Signed (Second Marker)   _____

Literature review update

This section is included to allow students to gain credit for improving their literature review following feedback on the interim report. Higher marks should be awarded where there is evidence of a substantial improvement in the students review or where there is little or no change and the initial review was of high quality. In general marks for the literature review relate to the identification of key issues and & proper referencing of literature relevant to project area. A review should be a concise and critical discussion of key issues and works relevant to project area. The literature review should clearly address the identified areas of the research question which is set out in the student's Introduction Chapter of the final report.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1st	Excellent improvement. Student has gone beyond the comments on the original review and produced a very well integrated critical discussion with a high percentage of journal articles. *Or* Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated as 1st class **(in this case award the lower value 70)**	70-100
2.1	Good improvement. Student has taken obvious note of the comments on the original review and produced a well-integrated critical discussion with a good percentage of journal articles. *Or* Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated 2.1. **(in this case award the lower value 60)**	60-69
2.2	Fair improvement. Student has taken some note of the comments on the original review and produced a discussion with some critical analysis and some journal articles. *Or* Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated 2.2. **(in this case award the lower value 50)**	50-59
3	Poor level of improvement. Student has taken little note of the comments on the original review. *Or* Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated 3. **(in this case award the lower value 40)**	40-49
Fail	No improvement. Student has taken no note of the comments on the original review. *Or* Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated Fail. **(in this case award <u>zero</u>)**	0-39

Mark awarded: ___80_____

Comment:

The original literature review at the Interim Report stage was excellent. However, every (albeit minor) feedback comment has been taken on board from that stage and the total number of references cited has been significantly enhanced. There are not 64 in total (from 50 at the Interim Report stage)

Development of Project Methodology

Marks relate to the clarity with which the student describes and justifies the primary research method adopted for their project; its general and detailed design, its selection of subjects/participants, configuration, materials, procedure and any associated data capture instruments, the extent to which the study could be duplicated by following the description in this section. It would be expected that the student would analyse the objectives of the project and the findings of the literature review in their discussion and presentation of the detailed methodology.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1st	Excellent. A very clear, complete methods section containing all relevant sub-sections. Choice of approach very well supported by references/ analysis of the problem and literature review conclusions.	70-100
2.1	Good. A clear and complete methods section containing all relevant sub-sections. Choice of approach supported by references/ analysis of the problem and literature review conclusions.	60-69
2.2	Fair. A description of the methods adopted is provided under all or most of the headings. Some justification is provided, with a degree of analysis and direct support from the students literature review..	50-59
3	Poor. While some description of the methods adopted exists it is in limited detail. Limited or no justification/analysis is provided.	40-49
Fail	Very poor. Very limited or no description of the methods adopted or why they were chosen.	0-39

Mark awarded: ___75____

Comment:

This is a very good section indeed. The nature of the primary method (i.e. an evaluation) is very well justified and supported by reference to literature.

He has also utilised a range of evaluation techniques (3 in total) to provide a wider range of evaluative information, both quantitative and qualitative in nature. The details of each also being well justified and supported through discussion/analysis and citations.

Personally I would have liked a bit more depth of detail of the nature of the software (i.e. its main functional areas) in his justification of the selection of that software as suitable for the evaluation. Thus I have put my assessment of this at the "lower" end of excellent.

Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)

The marks relate to: the quality and clarity of the presentation and initial analysis of summary results in tabular, list or graphical format. The clarity of the description of the key characteristics of results. Appropriate labelling of tables and graphs.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1st	Excellent. Results are very clearly and concisely laid out and well described. All key findings are highlighted and some initial discussion of their meaning in relation to the detail of the project is presented. Graphs and tables are selected intelligently and are appropriately and clearly labelled.	70-100
2.1	Good. Results are clearly and concisely laid out and well described. Key findings are highlighted with some initial discussion of them within the context of the investigation. Graphs and tables are appropriately labelled.	60-69
2.2	Fair. Results are laid out and described. Some key findings are highlighted with a degree of initial comment in relation to the context of the project investigation. Graphs and tables are labelled but not always clearly. Insufficient summarisation of data.	50-59
3	Poor. Results are not well laid out and may not be summarised. There is very little additional commentary within the context of the overall project given. Choice and presentation of tables and graphs is poor. Poor labelling.	40-49
Fail	Very poor. Limited and poorly presented results and/or lack of summarisation.	0-39

Mark awarded: __75_____

Comment:

There is a comprehensive presentation and initial analysis of the results. This section is over 20% of the complete report. Thus, it demonstrates significant data capture and analysis. It is well laid out and the discussion given picks out some key highlights in relation to the literature review discussion and the relationship the findings have with similar work.

Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work:

The marks relate to: the degree to which the student summarises and explains the outcome of their project, the degree to which they put their results in the context of what is known about the topic area; the extent to which they discuss the relevance of the results to the stated research questions/hypotheses; the extent of the critical analysis of their own work, the quality and appropriateness of the suggested areas for further study.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1st	Excellent. A thorough, concise and critical evaluation of the results of the project in the context of what is known about the topic area. Good discussion about the meaning of the results in the light of the work of others. A clear and constructive critical analysis of the students own work, including the project results, but also the execution of the project methodology. The discussion clearly identifies the extent to which research questions were addressed and lays out interesting and innovative areas for further development/research. The student should set out the possible implications which aspects of their findings might have for the problem (and related) area(s).	70-100
2.1	Good. A critical evaluation of the results of the project in the context of what is known about the topic area with reference to the work of others. A constructive critical analysis of the students own work. The discussion identifies the extent to which research questions were addressed and lays out areas for further development/research.	60-69
2.2	Fair. Some evaluation of the results of the project in the context of what is known about the topic area with some reference to the work of others. Some critical analysis of the students own work. Some discussion of the research questions and the extent to which they were answered. Some discussion of further areas for development/research.	50-59
3	Poor. Little evaluation of the results of the project. Limited reference to what is known about the topic area and little or no reference to the work of others. Limited reference to the research questions and how they were answered. Limited critical analysis of the students own work. Limited discussion of further areas for development/research.	40-49
Fail	Very poor. No evaluation of the results of the project. Limited or no reference to what is known about the topic area and no reference to the work of others. No reference to the research questions and how they were answered. Limited or no critical analysis of the students own work. No discussion of further areas for development/research.	0-39

Mark awarded: ____75_____

Comment:

Overall there is a very good and at times perceptive analysis of the results with reference to the work and findings for others. He also comments on the limitations of his own evaluation in terms of the smaller scale nature of the study (e.g. the fact that it was a comparatively short, but still valid, timescale for the evaluation and thus could be further built upon; e.g. the fact that a longer study could use a different test method than the NARA test of reading) and the potential limitations of the software e.g. identifying the lack of phonological awareness skills activities within the software.

However, he could have given a bit more elaborative depth in terms of the implications his findings suggest for other work or the development of Reading Assisted Software generally. His final aspect of his report tended to just be a couple of general style paragraphs commenting on this.

Supervisor's Marking: Richard Foley

Final Documentation:

The marks relate to: the quality of the presentation of the report (both format and writing style); the appropriateness of the structure of the report; and the presence of the appropriate and specified sections within the report and the overall depth given in these sections.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1st	Excellent. Exceptionally well structured and presented report. All sections complete and appropriate.	70-100
2.1	Good. Well structured and presented report. All sections complete and appropriate.	60-69
2.2	Fair. Adequate presentation and attention to structure. All sections complete and appropriate	50-59
3	Poor. Inadequate presentation and attention to structure. One section may be incomplete or missing.	40-49
Fail	Very Poor. Little attention to appearance and structure. Several sections may be incomplete or missing.	0-39

Mark awarded: ___85_____

Comment:

Excellent Narrative and reporting style in his writing. Very complete and comprehensive document.

Supervisor only

Student effort and self reliance

The marks relate to: the effort that the student put into the project work; the extent to which the student needed staff support.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1st	Excellent. Student consistently worked above levels normally expected at honours and/or was extremely self reliant.	70-100
2.1	Good. Student worked hard on project and/or was generally self reliant	60-69
2.2	Fair. Adequate effort applied to project but student needed additional support in some areas.	50-59
3	Poor. Inadequate effort applied to project and/or student needed high levels of support.	40-49
Fail	Very Poor. Appeared to make little effort and/or student needed constant support.	0-39

Mark awarded: __75_____

Comment:

Student was highly self-reliant. No assistance was required with the project logistics at all. He took on board all suggestions and developed them independently.

Supervisor's Marking: Richard Foley
Summary of marks for honours report

Colonel Mustard

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (65%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	80	0.05	4
Development of Project Methodology.	75	0.15	11.3
Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)	75	0.2	15
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	75	0.15	11.3
Final Documentation	85	0.05	4.3
Student effort and self reliance	75	0.05	3.8
		0.65	Total out of 65: 49.7

Supervisor mark (out of 65):　　　　　_____**49.7**_____

Second marker mark (out of 65):　　　　_____

Agreed mark for honours project (out of 65):　　_____

Comment: