School of Engineering and Computing

Computing-Based UG Programmes

Honours Project marks
Experiment/case study style project

Student: Jafar

Supervisor: Dimitrios Liarokapis

Second marker: Richard Foley

Honours year: 2009/2010   **Date of report marking: _20 /_5_/10**

Agreed summary of marks

Interim report	**mark out of 20**	_____
Honours report	**mark out of 70**	___53.65/70 = 77%_____
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
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 <u>zero</u>)**	0-39

Mark awarded: ___78_____

Comment:
There is very little textual change from the already excellent version of the literature review at the interim report stage. However there is still an increase in the overall number of sources utilised throughout the work (87 sources as compared to 82 from the Interim Report). This is a truly outstanding body of literature upon which to base the work and is evidence of a wide knowledge and understanding of the underlying topic and issues in the project area. I also liked the summary conclusions for the literature report which had been added from the interim report. One could see how this could be effectively used to form a shorter literature review of the sort of style one might expect in a conference article if this work was "converted" into such and submitted for publication at an appropriate conference.

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: __80_____

Comment:
The case for the use of simulation had been well made (and supported) in the introduction section. Thus the methods section itself presented a well argued and again well supported case for the use of NS2 as the most appropriate simulation package. One of the key things in simulation based networking projects is to justify the experimental scenarios. This includes the topology, the traffic "pattern", and the measures to be recorded for analysis. She does this excellently with her discussion of the underlying traffic model, mobility model, simulation variables and metrics sub-sections of this chapter. In all cases the key decisions are supported by both appropriate citations and critical argument. A number of these use well-established "benchmarks" for simulations and so this reinforces the validity of her experiments. There are a significant number of simulations proposed (117 in total) and this generates a vast amount of data. Thus she also outlines the procedures for using appropriate UNIX tool. She also outlines the issues she had during the testing/set up of the simulations and their resolution in the actual execution of the simulations. This is excellent academic rigour which is being demonstrated here.

Richard Foley – 2nd Marker

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: ___78_____

Comment:
The results are very clearly laid out and it is the key comparative information which has been "gleaned" from the analysis of the significant output trace files produced by the simulations. This is very easy to read and very comprehensive. It really paints a very clear picture of the relative overall performance and the individual strengths and weaknesses of each protocol in each distinct scenario. Very intelligently selected graphs and good initial discussion of the results, particularly interesting results again the initial hypotheses.

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: ___69_____

Comment:
I might be being a bit "picky" and thus harsher that I should be but I felt that the initial resume then the discussion/reflection on the overall results could have been a little more concise as (particularly in the latter case) an overall discussion of the results certainly in relation to the hypotheses was given. There also wasn't specific reflection on the (general success) of the project's simulation methodology. Nonetheless they were useful overall conclusions and there was some reference to the work of others when reflecting on the results. There was also some reasonable identification of the future work/implications subsequent to this work.

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: ___75_____

Comment:
Very well presented report, very good format, sections were generally comprehensive, excellent academic writing style. It was a slight pity that the intro did not end by outlining the rest of the report, also a little strange that the title is the research question rather than a "proper" title, and there was an inconsistent use of both "ragged-edge" and justified margins. Having said that it was absolutely crystal clear what she was doing in all stages of the project via this report. Nonetheless in the grand scheme of things these are very "picky" in an overall excellent report and project. If not for these "Minor" issues an even higher mark here would have been achieved.

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
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: __85_____

Comment: Student extremely self-reliant and consistently working above normally expected levels

Summary of marks for honours report

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (70%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	78	0.05	3.9
Development of Project Methodology.	80	0.15	12
Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)	78	0.2	15.6
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	69	0.15	10.4
Final Documentation	75	0.1	7.5
Student effort and self reliance	85	0.05	4.25
		0.70	Total out of 70: (53.65)

Supervisor mark (out of 70):   _____

Second marker mark (out of 70):   _____**53.65**_____

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

Comment: