

**School of Engineering and Computing**  
**Computing-Based UG Programmes**

**Honours Project marks**  
**Experiment/case study style project**

**Student: Professor Calculus (77%)**

**Supervisor: Richard Foley**

**Second marker: Eddie Gray**

**Honours year: 2007/2008**

**Date of report marking: \_\_/6/08\_\_**

**Agreed summary of marks**

<b>Interim report</b>	<b>mark out of 20</b>	_____
<b>Honours report</b>	<b>mark out of 65</b>	<b>__50.2/65 = 77%__</b>
<b>Presentation</b>	<b>mark out of 15</b>	_____

**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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	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 <sup>st</sup> class <b>(in this case award the lower value 70)</b>	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. <b>(in this case award the lower value 60)</b>	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. <b>(in this case award the lower value 50)</b>	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. <b>(in this case award the lower value 40)</b>	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. <b>(in this case award zero)</b>	0-39

**Mark awarded:**    **78**

**Comment:**

**The literature review (which was previously excellent) now has an additional 10 references (thus 77 in total). Also all of the (albeit very minor) points made have been addressed. Thus a consistent performance with some improvement.**

### ***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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	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:**    68

**Comment:**

To be honest, whilst very well written and making a very clear and supported justification for the approach of using a explanatory experiment in this type of Software Engineering project, I was actually a little disappointed that the mechanism and criteria he used in the experiment were not so clearly outlined. Certainly the use of a trial mapping was good and this would have provided the perfect vehicle if the explanation of the process of examining the CMMI KPA documentation and relating it to the XP practice was more explicitly identified and explained. Thus, overall (at 5 pages) the coverage of the method is a little short.

### **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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	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:**

The amount of work done in carrying out a systematic and rigour evaluation of 19 mappings across 12 KPAs consisting in total of 142 specific practices was a very very significant effort indeed. The discussion against each was comprehensive and provided some very interesting insight into the relationships between specific CMMI KPAs and how these were satisfied or otherwise by the practices of XP. The results are presented over 43 pages, but the actual experiment involved analysis running to a further 60 pages of appendices work. Indeed to some extent this material isn't just results, but also demonstrates the development and execution of the methodology itself. Thus that could be viewed as a minor downside since it isn't just a summary of the findings and potentially could have been summarised with a bit more conciseness. Certainly the student demonstrates significant understanding of the detail of his findings.

### ***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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	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: 85**

#### **Comment:**

**This section is very insightful indeed. The results are fully summarised and critically analysed. The discussion makes plenty of references to the work of others to support the findings as appropriate. The presentation here actually presents reasons for positive or negative findings of the mappings and then suggests positive ways in which improvements could be made. The suggestions both relate to how XP could be generally complimented by adding supporting practices to enable CMMI compliance, as well as examples where existing CMMI compliant organisations might identify where the incorporation of specific XP practices could be integrated into existing quality practices. The quality of discussion and the sheer amount of analysis given is comprehensive.**

### ***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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	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. Very well written, fully complete and very comprehensive. Possibly could have been a bit more concise in the detailed results section, but I would be being very harsh to overly penalise for that when one judges the standard of this documentary submission across the range of honours project submissions.

## **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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	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:**

This really was a colossal effort by the student. There is no way that I would have expected an undergraduate student to conduct such a comprehensive documentary based analysis of the complete CMMI-Dev documentation. The detail of his approach was developed solely by himself, with only general "prompting"/suggestion from the supervisor.

## Summary of marks for honours report

Professor Calculus

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (65%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	78	0.05	3.9
Development of Project Methodology.	68	0.15	10.2
Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)	75	0.2	15
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	85	0.15	12.8
Final Documentation	80	0.05	4
Student effort and self reliance	85	0.05	4.3
		0.65	Total out of 65: 50.2

**Supervisor mark (out of 65):** 50.2

**Second marker mark (out of 65):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Agreed mark for honours project (out of 65):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comment:**