School of Computing and Mathematical Science

Division of Computing

Honours Project marks
Experiment/case study style project

Student: Captain Haddock (64%)

Supervisor James Paterson

Second marker: Richard Foley

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	____41.5/65 = 64%_____
Presentation	mark out of 15	_____

Total mark out of 100   _____

Signed (Supervisor)   _____

Signed (Second Marker)   _____42_____

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
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.	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.	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.	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.	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.	0-39

Mark awarded: ___60_____

Comment: There is essentially no change from the literature review. Both the justification of his project topic and the areas of investigation where reasonably discussed via the literature. Overall he has a wide range of literature sources in his reference list.

Methods.

Marks relate to the clarity with which the student describes and justifies the methods adopted; general design, subjects/participants, materials and procedure. The extent to which the study could be duplicated by following the description in this section,

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.	70-100
2.1	Good. A clear and complete methods section containing all relevant sub-sections. Choice of approach supported by references.	60-69
2.2	Fair. A description of the methods adopted is provided under all or most of the headings. Some justification is provided.	50-59
3	Poor. While some description of the methods adopted exists it is in limited detail. Limited or no justification 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: ___62____

Comment: Overall there is a good description of his experimental tests. That description is such that these tests could be repeated. It is also clear that he has given some thought and put in some effort into the construction of successful tests, through the use of initial test simulations. What I feel is missing,

though, is the "support" for this type of method. He doesn't use any supporting references to justify the use of such experiments for this type of project. The other area where he is lacking in this respect is that he is not justifying his test configuration. E.g. In what way is his test configuration "representative" of a "typical" enterprise network? It seems that the test configuration is "divorced" from the enterprise element of his investigation. As presented it could just be a series of "stand alone" tests to demonstrate general performance. It may be that his test configurations (given only in appendices) are "representative. However, he has no detailed discussion or justification of that. One sees the occasional mention of "branch" and "HQ" in his description, but he really should (in a 1st class report) have a discussion which actually properly presents the nature of each test configuration (as well as presenting that argument in the main report).

Results

The marks relate to: the quality and clarity of the presentation 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. 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. Graphs and tables are appropriately labelled.	60-69
2.2	Fair. Results are laid out and described. Some key findings are highlighted. 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. 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:___65_____

Comment: His actual results (i.e. the "facts and figures") are well presented. However in hindsight I think that he may have been better to "combine" his presentation of the results with his initial discussion so that the "key finding" highlights are clear. However, his subsequent discussion (in his next chapter) does clearly demonstrate that he is aware of the key findings of his results and what they mean. However it would have been "nice" for these to have been presented at the same time as the results themselves. The presentation is "spoiled" a bit by his presenting more detail of his final test results in his discussion of that test. He should have had a better balance of presentation here.

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. 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:____68_____

Comment: This aspect of his report is really quite good. He takes each of his original test hypotheses and does discuss his results in term of how they answer each. He also tries to give some analysis as to reasons behind the results and (to some extent) what that means for the experiment and also the general scenario. He has, however, absolutely no references at all to the work of others, nor does he try to relate his findings to the "ideas" of others from any literature sources. His discussion does, though, clearly address in some good detail at times the extent to which the research questions are addressed. He makes some comment about the other areas of research which would be required in order to enable any feasible P2P enterprise wide system, but this is more of a "high level" comment rather than any detailed identification of "follow on" projects which other students might be able to undertake related to his specific work

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
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: ___50_____

Comment: This is a good well-structured report which is easy to read and is mostly complete. However, there is some use of the 1st person ("I") in the report. There are also some basic issues of presentation, such as not taking a new page for each main section and starting each section as x.0. Also his main chapters are imbalanced, e.g. his last 3 main chapters 7.0, 8.0, 9.0 shouldn't really be separate complete main "chapters". There are also clear examples of figures (in the literature review) which come from an "external" source, but that source has not been directly acknowledged. This is "by definition" plagiarism. However, due to its "isolation" it has only been treated as poor academic practice. However, some markers might have decided to "take it further" and students generally should be very wary of such poor academic writing practice.

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:__70_____

Comment: The student was very self-reliant and developed real enthusiasm and motivation for this topic.

Summary of marks for honours report

Captain Haddock

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (65%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	60	0.05	3
Methods.	62	0.15	9.3
Results	65	0.2	13
Discussion, Conclusions and further work	68	0.15	10.2
Final Documentation	50	0.05	2.5
Student effort and self reliance	70	0.05	3.5
		0.65	Total out of 65:41.5

Supervisor mark (out of 65):   _____**41.5**_____

Second marker mark (out of 65):   _____

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

Comment: