School of Engineering and Built Environment

Computing-Based UG Programmes

Honours Project marks
Experimental style project

Student: The Joker (56%)

Supervisor: Huaglory Tianfield

Second marker: Richard Foley

Honours year: 2011/2012   **Date of report marking: _23 /_4_/12**

Agreed summary of marks

Interim report	**mark out of 20**	_____
Honours report	**mark out of 70**	___39.3/70 = 56%_____
Poster Presentation	**mark out of 10**	_____

Total mark out of 100   _____

Signed (Supervisor)   _____

Signed (Second Marker)   _____

Richard Foley - 2nd 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
1st	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. *Or* Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated as 1st 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. *Or* 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. *Or* 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. *Or* 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. *Or* Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated Fail. **(in this case award zero)**	0-39

Mark awarded: ___60_____

Comment: 44 sources is a good effort at a body of supporting literature. Literature review is essentially identical to the Interim Report stage, thus same mark.

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
1st	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: ___52____

Comment: A (rather brief)justification is given of the experimental approach for this type of project. He suggests that there are several (similar) methods used which have been published, but only briefly mentions one of these. there is also some reasonable detail (mostly all "monologue") of the specific experiments he is going to carry out. However, there is a general lack of justification for these in his presentation and also not particularly linked back explicitly to the previous literature review. For example, in his first experiment he talks about using a dictionary of 943 words! Why 943? Where did he get these from? He also gives no source reference for his Third Party software, or any discussion about how he sourced it and any others he had sourced and considered. he is clearly doing something in his experiments which are potentially systematic and possibly have some basis in academic rigour, but he is not fulfilling any of that potential in his presentation.

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
1st	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: ___58_____

Comment: Overall this was a better section and did demonstrate that there was some element of rigour in the conduct of the experiments even if their justification was not so well done. There isn't a huge amount of discussion, more that the key headlines are identified. However, it did clearly demonstrate that if individuals using the Amazon cloud storage do not utilise security policies/guidelines then there data is vulnerable. the scope of some of the results, however, were unclear. E.g. he found 4559 files through the global bucket experiment, but I didn't get any overall sense of what this suggested in terms of the total cloud storage of the Amazon system. It was not very clear how much of that system his Bucket finder software "Trawled" so that he could make a considered estimate from his sample as to the extent of how much user data was stored without any form of proper security. After all his results suggested that this Cloud System was a potential "rich picking ground" for hackers to find out personal/sensitive information which could clearly be used for unethical/criminal purposes.

Richard Foley - 2nd Marker

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
1st	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: ___49_____

Comment: This final chapter was a bit disappointing. Again it was all "monologue", when better sectioning and presentation would have helped to highlight individual conclusions. He gave a good overall summary of the finding of his individual experiments, but there was then a lack of any real detailed discussion of these in terms of possible implications, overall guidance for users, advice for service providers of Cloud based data storage, other work in the area of Cloud security. He presents his specific work, summarises it clearly, but doesn't really provide much in the way of critical analysis.

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
1st	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: Generally a clearly presented report. Academic writing good in the early part (Intro and Literature Review), but it becomes more presentational from his methods chapter onwards. Still it is a reasonable good effort at documentation and I am clear about what he has done.

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. You should also consider the initiative and contribution the student demonstrated at Supervisory Meetings with you during the course of the project when assessing against the criteria here.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1st	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: __70_____

Comment:

Summary of marks for Honours Report

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (70%)	Weighted mark
Literature review		0.05	**3**
Development of Project Methodology.	52	0.15	**7.8**
Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)	58	0.2	**11.6**
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	49	0.15	**7.4**
Final Documentation	60	0.1	**6**
Student effort and self reliance	70	0.05	**3.5**
		0.70	Total out of 70: **39.3**

Supervisor mark (out of 70): _____

Second marker mark (out of 70): _____**39.3**_____

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

Comment: