

School of Engineering and Computing
Computing-Based UG Programmes

Honours Project marks
Experiment/case study style project

(Note: whilst the student generally describes their project as Develop and Test, it is really the HCI evaluation of an interface simulation prototype, it is not a functioning application using a development environment in which a fully engineered email system would be produced.)

Student: Princess Jasmine

Supervisor: Caroline Park (Julie Campbell)

Second marker: Richard Foley

Honours year: 2009/2010

Date of report marking: _13 / _5 _/10

Agreed summary of marks

Interim report	mark out of 20	_____
Honours report	mark out of 70	<u>40.7/70 = 58%</u>
Poster Presentation	mark out of 10	_____

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
1 st	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. <i>Or</i> Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated as 1 st 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. <i>Or</i> 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. <i>Or</i> 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. <i>Or</i> 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. <i>Or</i> Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated Fail. (in this case award zero)	0-39

Mark awarded: 65

Comment:

The body of literature used in the updated report is more significant (i.e. 39 refs compared to the 29 of the Interim Report). There are several areas which have improved from the interim report, e.g. a clear discussion of the ways in which ageing factors of individuals affect the interface considerations for that population. There is a bit more in most of the previously existing sections (but not so much as that initial section) but there is significant new material about evaluation methods. Thus overall a good improvement from the interim report and it is clear that the student took note of the feedback given,

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
1 st	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: **58**

Comment:

There was no overall discussion/justification about the project methodology used however the overview of the primary project activities were clear in terms of how it was conducted. There was also some use of supporting literature for the individual methods used and so some rigour in the approach starts to come through. To be honest the student should have given a bit more than just general detail of the questions/questionnaires. Similarly a lot more commentary on both the first (paper) and second (powerpoint) prototype. It is clear (from the appendices) that a reasonable amount of work and rigour was done for both of these, but if part of the purpose of the project is to investigate the User Centred approach then the student should really discuss the outcomes from the first two evaluations and showing how the feedback influenced the evolving design. There is a little of that when presenting the third prototype but I would have expected more. I would also have expected commentary on the development of the task list for the user based evaluation. There is however the occasional reference to supporting literature though.

Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)

The marks relate to: the quality and clarity of the presentation and initial analysis/discussion 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
1 st	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: __62__

Comment:

The results section is very substantial indeed (almost 40 pages). It is clear that the student has used SPSS and this does tend to have larger graph presentation and additional tables and so this might be reduced a bit with a different presentation package, however it is still very detailed nonetheless and credit should be given for that as again it does show some element of rigour in undertaking the project. It is also here that the student tries to give some “results” from the paper prototype but it just seems to be a list of quotes, there is no proper additional commentary. Probably, in retrospect, the student’s “design and implementation” section is where the discussion should have been so that we “see” how the user centred approach (done during the second part of the focus group exercise) influenced the evolution of the design of the interface. Whilst the presentation is quite comprehensive, the “commentary” tends to just be a description of the graphs, there really should be more discussion on findings. There is generally a concluding comment given, but a little occasional further discussion with the occasional reference to previous literature would have been useful.

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
1 st	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: ____45____

Comment:

To be honest this final section is quite disappointing. It is very short and doesn't really pick up on the key conclusions from the project. It is clear from the lengthy results section that the student gained some useful information about how well or otherwise the various interface components were received by the target audience, but she gave none of that in this section. She could easily have proposed a set of basic guidelines for developers to follow which had some degree of confirmation from her research. She also could have discussed what this might mean for the general context of the older user of computers (say) in other application types. There was no reference back to other work which had been highlighted (say) in the literature review to comment on how the work done related to this positively or negatively. Really this was lacking in any critical analysis or wider context. The final "Future Research" section looks simply to be something written done just as the deadline was approaching. All of the ideas really should be much more fully developed.

Final Documentation:

The marks relate to: the quality of the presentation of the report (format, discursive content, analysis 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
1 st	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: ____65____

Comment:

Overall the general documentation is well formatted and much of the academic writing is very good in style. Obviously some of the sections are a bit thin as already commented upon.

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
1 st	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: ____60____

Comment: Generally a competent student although some support required at times

Summary of marks for honours report

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (70%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	65	0.05	3.3
Development of Project Methodology.	58	0.15	8.7
Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)	62	0.2	12.4
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	45	0.15	6.8
Final Documentation	65	0.1	6.5
Student effort and self reliance	60	0.05	3.0
		0.70	Total out of 70: (40.7)

Supervisor mark (out of 70):

Second marker mark (out of 70):

_____ **40.7** _____

Agreed mark for honours project (out of 70):

Comment: