

School of Engineering and Computing
Computing-Based UG Programmes

Honours Project marks
Experiment/case study style project

Student: Judge Doom

Supervisor: Dimitrios Liarokapis

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	_____55.75/70 = 80%_____
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: 75

Comment:

A good increase in the body of literature used (66 refs compared to the already excellent 59 from the interim report). Also the coverage has increased significantly (from 13 to 24 pages) with more specific areas in relation to the technical aspects of the problem being dealt with. All in all there is a large amount of critical analysis in this excellent literature review.

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: 80

Comment:

This section is undertaken with very significant rigour. There is some general justification of the use of a simulation as a project methodology and it is supported with references. However, the section then continues with an extremely clear (and again very well supported) discussion of all elements of the simulation scenarios. This is just the sort of excellent level of discussion and analysis we are looking for. This is a real exemplar for Networking students and demonstrates excellent academic rigour in the derivation of the simulations. He could possibly have given a little overview about how he implemented these scenarios in OPNET (he does have some appendix info) but maybe it is a cases of “the more he gives me the more I want” and really I am asking for far too much!

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: 80

Comment:

Again this is a very comprehensive section (50 pages). To be honest I think that the student has probably done about “3” projects. By that I mean that I would expect it to be sufficient for a Networking student to conduct a project which evaluated VoIP and Video in a single scenario (or just one over a set of scenarios). It is thus highly commendable that this student has undertaken a very comprehensive project which covered 3 different wireless technologies. Often when presenting such a large number of results, the presentation can suffer. However, again the student has approached the task with rigour and has a very clear presentation of the results and provides key conclusions for each scenario. This latter aspect helps to enable the key findings to be highlighted for the comprehensively laid out and discussed detailed results.

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: 78

Comment:

This is again another substantial section with plenty of discussion and analysis. I thought that it started a bit “back to front” when he gave the basic results in relation to his research question and then gave a evaluation of his project (which he also did in a “blow by blow” fashion against his project objectives. He would have been better to have given a resume of the project and incorporated some reflection on his objectives within that as a discussion/presentation, then he could have moved on to the conclusions both in terms of his research questions/hypotheses and the specifics each scenario. Again, having said that there was plenty of discussion and his discussion in relation to the work of others demonstrated that he has a clear grasp of the subject area and its overall context. He hits (again) all of the “Excellent” grading criteria very well.

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: ____80____

Comment:

Excellent final report, very comprehensive, everything well-formatted and structured. It was a slight pity that he didn't choose a proper project title, but used his research question instead!

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: ____85____

Comment: Excellent work, very self reliant, well above normal standard

Summary of marks for honours report

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (70%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	75	0.05	3.8
Development of Project Methodology.	80	0.15	12
Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)	80	0.2	16
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	78	0.15	11.7
Final Documentation	80	0.1	8
Student effort and self reliance	85	0.05	4.25
		0.70	Total out of 70: (55.75)

Supervisor mark (out of 70):

Second marker mark (out of 70):

_____ **55.75** _____

Agreed mark for honours project (out of 70):

Comment: