

School of Engineering and Computing
Computing-Based UG Programmes

Honours Project marks

Experiment/case study style project

(Note: whilst this project did involve the student writing some code to enable the simulation of a new environment to be executed, this project is essentially a (simulation-based) experimental project)

Student: Student L 09-10

Supervisor: Huaglory Tianfield

Second marker: Richard Foley

Honours year: 2009/2010

Date of report marking: _18 /_5_/10

Agreed summary of marks

Interim report	mark out of 20	<hr/>
Honours report	mark out of 70	<hr/> 48.65/70 = 70% <hr/>
Poster Presentation	mark out of 10	<hr/>

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:

There was a good increase in the total number of literature sources (77 from 61 in the Interim Report). This is outstanding when compared with the excellent body of literature already amassed in the Interim Report. It is also clear that he has restructured his literature review as suggested from the Interim Report. I did find it a little unusual thought he referred to the interim report directly in his intro to this, he should just have written about his literature review structure as a "Free-standing" issue in this report.

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: **70**

Comment:

He includes a good discussion about the nature of the project methodology and clearly justifies both the general and specific simulation-based experimental approach as a suitable for this type of project. It is also clear that he uses his hypotheses as a basis for deriving the data collection of his proposed simulation experiments. All of this is accompanied and very well supported by appropriate literature. It is also clear that the set up and development of his experimental environment was done with rigour but again it would have benefited from diagrams showing the environment and the relationship between the components. Some screenshot or similar would also have helped, as I did find it difficult to get the “big picture” of the experiment simulation environment.

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: __68__

Comment:

Whilst there are again no tables as one would expect to summarise the results, the discussion of them in relation to the project is quite mature and to a great degree insightful. He clearly has a grasp of the topic area and the related literature as he comments on both during the discussion. Overall there is quite a bit of analysis in his results presentation. The fact that his final experiment didn't achieve an outcome does not matter in the overall project as again his initial set up and his amendments to deal with it show excellent rigour. Thus at the end of the day, I don't really agree with his "Conclusion" (in the next section) that it was due to poor planning and time management, At the end of the day this is really quite an advanced research-based project!

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: 70

Comment:

I found his discussion on each objective a bit unusual but actually quite interesting. He again gave some discussion of relevance to the topic area and also a degree of reflection on the project process itself. Thus all in all there is good constructive critical analysis of the student's work and the execution of his methodology. I found the pessimism which came through a bit in the student's presentation rather misplaced. This was clearly a project which as he himself said "undeniably chartered new waters" with probably the first independent academic analysis of the iHEED protocol and the first simulation of the application. It is very clear from his discussion that he has touched upon a very interesting research area and his specific comments about future work and building upon this project indicate that.

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: __60__

Comment:

No section heading numbering/sub-numbering and so it does make the structure a bit less clear.. No outline of structure at the end of chapter 1. Generally there is too much whitespace between paragraphs. In a couple of places he refers to Appendix x (has he omitted it or forgotten to go back to complete a reference during proof-reading). Unusually there are no diagrams/tables at all and this poor style does detract from his presentation. The basic reporting style and academic writing quality, however, is actually very good and certainly as a report it is comprehensive and in-depth. But ultimately the limitations in his report style did “suppress” a lot of the underlying “excellence” in this project content and execution and the mark her has to, unfortunately, reflect that.

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 student, very self reliant, covered both experimental and software development issues with significant independence

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.	70	0.15	10.5
Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)	68	0.2	13.6
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	70	0.15	10.5
Final Documentation	60	0.1	6
Student effort and self reliance	85	0.05	4.25
		0.70	Total out of 70: (48.65)

Supervisor mark (out of 70): _____

Second marker mark (out of 70): _____ **48.65** _____

Agreed mark for honours project (out of 70): _____

Comment: Could have gained a higher mark but was let down a bit by poorer reporting style under Results and some poor formatting.