

School of Computing and Mathematical Science

Division of Computing

Honours Project marks

Develop & test style project

Student: Dr Black (42%)

Supervisor Richard Foley

Second marker: Jim Paterson

Honours year: 2005/2006

Date of report marking: __ /6/06__

Agreed summary of marks

Interim report	mark out of 20	_____
Honours report	mark out of 65	_____ 27.5/65 = 42% _____
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.

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.	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.	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.	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.	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.	0-39

Mark awarded: 65

Comment: This is quite a good improvement on the version of the review in the Interim report. Setting aside points of physical presentation (dealt with by the Final Documentation section of the marking scheme) it is written as a coherent literature review which does actually discuss the literature and does so in a manner which “builds” up the “picture” to directly support what he is going to use in his implementation based “evaluation”. It is still a bit short thought and he is possibly still lacking in the number of literature sources. He could also have presented a bit more of the technical detail of his 2 server side paradigms which he intended to use, but this is really a very good discussion.

Problem and systems analysis.

Marks relate to the detail of the analysis of the problem the project is trying to solve and the clarity and completeness of the statement of functional and non-functional requirements,

Grade	Description	Mark range
1 st	Excellent. A very clear, well structured problem and systems analysis section. Clear and complete specification of requirements, both functional and non-functional, backed up by supporting material where appropriate.	70-100
2.1	Good. A clear and well structured problem and systems analysis section. A clear specification of requirements, both functional and non-functional, backed up by supporting material where appropriate.	60-69
2.2	Fair. A description of the problem and systems analysis is provided. Some specification of requirements, both functional and non-functional. There are however some gaps in the analysis.	50-59
3	Poor. While some description of the problem and systems analysis exists it is in limited detail. The specification of requirements is incomplete.	40-49
Fail	Very poor. Very limited or no description of the problem and systems analysis. Limited or no requirements.	0-39

Mark awarded: 35

Comment: He did look at the problem he was trying to “investigate” and did provide a good justification for his implementation based approach. However, he provides absolutely no discussion or even a semi-detailed presentation of how he derived his requirements. He simply says that there is a list of them in the appendices! In his “Methods” chapter he should really be taking 3-5 pages to detail how and why he decided upon using the test web-site that he decided upon (i.e. the GCAL home page) and discussed why it was a proper reflection of the type of typical site which would be browsed on both desktop and mobile devices. I.e. in what specific ways does it reflect the typical functionality of a suitable website for the purposes of his implementation “experiment”? He should also have had a proper discussion of the requirements of his mobile version and how it should be displayed and presented so that he would have a set of specific criteria upon which he could then present some results and have some detailed discussion of if the model 2 paradigm was successful (both overall and in dealing with each aspect of the expected functionality)

Project Design and implementation

The marks relate to: the quality and clarity of the design of the solution; the clarity and detail of the explanation for the design choices; clarity of the description of problems and issues involved in the implementation.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1 st	Excellent. A well presented and original/innovative solution which clearly fits the problem/task described in the earlier sections and is very well supported by justification. A clear and detailed explanation of the issues involved in selecting the design and the problems experienced and how these were addressed.	70-100
2.1	Good. A well presented solution which clearly fits the problem/task described in the earlier sections and is clearly justified. A clear and detailed explanation of the issues involved in selecting the design and the problems experienced and how these were addressed.	60-69
2.2	Fair. A solution which fits the problem/task described in the earlier sections with some justification. The student provides some explanation of the issues involved in selecting the design and the problems experienced and how these were addressed.	50-59
3	Poor. A poor solution which inadequately fits the problem/task described in the earlier sections and/or is poorly justified. The student provides little explanation of the issues involved in selecting the design and the problems experienced and how these were addressed.	40-49
Fail	Very poor. The solution does not fit the problem/task described in the earlier sections and/or no justification is offered. The student provides little or no explanation of the issues involved in selecting the design and the problems experienced and how these were addressed.	0-39

Mark awarded: 35

Comment: Again he (in his “Methods” chapter) just gives the briefest of overviews of the “construction” of his implementation. Again one would have expected that he would have given a brief overview of the tools he utilised (which to some extent he does) but then we really want the detailed “chapter and verse” of the student “constructing” the two solutions and actually discussing how each element of (in particular) the model 2 software architecture was developed to deal with each element of the key issues such as the separation of the content from the presentation and the content negotiation element. There isn’t even a diagram to demonstrate the implementation architecture in his actual construction. Essentially throughout he is providing “little explanation of the issues ... in selecting the problems experienced and how these were addressed”. It is only the briefest of overviews he is even attempting. One would have expected the complete code listing of his two website versions to be in the appendices and for him to have actually taken key code fragments which represented the solutions for the implementation of each of the key elements of his approach to be physically presented and fully discussed in his main report. None of that is done. He may very well have a solution which “fits the problem” but there is little significant detail or evidence given to support that in his report as presented. One would have expected him to do this and it would have been expected to form a reasonably sized presentation and discussion (e.g. 8-10 pages rather than a little over one page!)

Testing and Evaluation

The marks relate to: the quality of the design of the testing and evaluation strategy and its appropriateness for the specific project in question.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1 st	Excellent. Thorough, appropriate and exhaustive testing procedures, clearly described.	70-100
2.1	Good. Thorough and appropriate testing procedures, clearly described.	60-69
2.2	Fair. Some description of appropriate testing procedures but little justification or poorly described.	50-59
3	Poor. Little description of testing procedures and/or procedures inappropriate.	40-49
Fail	Very Poor. No testing described or completely inappropriate procedures adopted.	0-39

Comment: This element is also poor. He says that a qualitative research assessment was conducted. However (again) he give no details of the development of it, never mind the details of the assessment instrument itself. Again one would expect that 3-4 pages would be taken to give the detail of the test environment and the actual tests which he was to conduct and a discussion as to why these provide a reasonable set of criteria by which to make judgements based on their results. Unlike his other poor elements he doesn't really even have any appendix information about this and doesn't even refer to it as an example.

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. The discussion clearly identifies the extent to which research questions were addressed and lays out interesting and innovative areas for further development/research.	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: ____50____

Comment: To be honest he does actually make several relevant points. Again, however, he doesn't do them "justice" and it is less than a page and a half of discussion of these results. I found it interesting that (in chapter 4) he presented his results in the same order as the issues from the literature review. This shows to me that he has the general "Framework" for a reasonable evaluation, but it simply also re-enforced the "failings" in his report in terms of him not providing the "missing link" of the detailed discussion of the implementation and testing which he "allegedly" carried out and through which he came to these conclusions. This could have been a really good project in terms of a final assessment if only he had done that. This project should be used as an exemplar to other students of how you can have a very interesting and highly suitable project; and also have a clear understanding of it; and even have done reasonable work in conducting it; but end up with a very disappointing final mark due to not conveying this through the main assessment instruments used by the module to demonstrate the achievement of the student and by which a student's final Honours Award is influenced.

Final Documentation:

The marks relate to : the quality of the presentation of the report; the appropriateness of the structure of the report; and the presence of the appropriate and specified sections within the report.

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: __40__

Comment: His complete main report (including his front cover!) is only 22 pages! He has clearly done more “work” than 22 pages “worth” of report. His level of presentation is just “thin” and the key parts of the work, i.e. the presentation of detail in relation to his implementation work is just virtually non-existent. In general his text presentation has poor paragraphing. The actual writing is a good style and presents a good discussion in places but basically his sections (particularly) with the lack of any detail about his actual implementation and virtually no detail of results to present any kind of proper analysis or comparison of his two website approaches and a very limited discussion section are essentially incomplete.

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: __59__

Comment: To be honest the effort from the student was reasonable. His understanding of the technical issues was very clear through the discussions at supervisory meetings. The supervisor did not need to give him any advice about the actual technology details; he sourced all of them himself. He was (to be honest) a little tardy in making contact with his supervisor. At key points when prompted for supervisory meetings to assist him in the process and presentation of his project work, he did not take up those offers. To me this seems to be one of the key reasons why his final report is as disappointing in terms of its content and as a document which is supposed to properly “present” the work of his project.

Summary of marks for honours report

Dr Black

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (65%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	65	0.05	3.25
Problem and systems analysis.	35	0.1	3.5
Project Design and implementation	35	0.15	5.3
Testing and evaluation	30	0.10	3
Discussion, Conclusions and further work	50	0.15	7.5
Final Documentation	40	0.05	2
Student effort and self reliance	59	0.05	3
		0.65	Total out of 65: 27.55

Mark out of 65	Classification (%)
0-25.9	Fail
26-29.4	Low-med 3rd
29.5-32.4	High 3rd
32.5-35.4	Low 2.2 (50-55%)
35.5-38.9	High 2.2 (55-59%)
39-42.4	Low 2.1 (60-65%)
42.5-45.4	High 2.1 (65-69%)
45.5-51.9	1st (70-79%)
52+	1st (80-100%)

Supervisor mark (out of 65): _____ 27.55 _____

Second marker mark (out of 65): _____

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

Comment: