

School of Computing and Mathematical Science

Division of Computing

Honours Project marks

Experiment/case study style project

Student: Mr X (58%)

Supervisor: Richard Foley

Second marker: Julie Shields

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** 37.85/65 = 58%_____

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: 60_____

Comment: His Literature review is a fair to good improvement on that submitted in his Interim Report. Certainly it now has a much better structure and one can see that it is attempting to directly support the detail of his primary research. It is still lacking in detailed critical analysis but it does at least have relevant discussion in terms of the potential “connections” he has to explore in his primary research.

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
1 st	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: **58**

Comment: The student really just gave a fair description of his method. It is essentially a literature based analysis/ quasi experiment. He does have a clear method in undertaking this, i.e. he derives the various heading for conducting a mapping based relationship in order to understand the likely direct relationships between XP practices and the existing ISO framework. However, he is not really making a very forceful justification for this method. He really should be making the type of method more explicit (i.e. a framework to enable a literature based “documentary” analysis of XP practices to identify their relationships with ISO compliant QMS guidelines). He should also justify it as an appropriate method since very little work has been done in trying to explain and identify possible relationship with XP practices and existing SE processes (of which QMSs is a good example) and that sort of project would be an ideal precursor project to provide a more detailed framework for other projects. He simply skims over other methods with no proper reason for saying that they are not appropriate. For example, case study or questionnaire based projects in this area would not really be realistic since there are unlikely to be many available existing SE organisations that have both implemented Agile Methods and attempted to develop a QMS based around their SE life cycle and practices. Thus obtaining a good case study contact or a large number of potential respondents for a questionnaire based survey was unrealistic and would not be likely to provide much in terms of substantial results which would be sufficient to enable a reasonable discussion and be able to draw any form of realistic conclusions. He should really be making these points. Admittedly he did provide references to similar use of this method, i.e. literature based analysis to identify relationships between Agile methods and (other) aspects of traditional SE practices. In that sense he was trying to show that using this type of method is both “tried and trusted” and acceptable for an area of research such as this where the lack of understanding of the relationship between basic aspects of Agile Methods and current SE practices is one of the clear requirements for research in this whole topic area.

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
1 st	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: 60

Comment: Ultimately the results he obtained are reasonably substantial in quantity at least. His summary based tabular presentation shows that he has attempted to follow his method in a sound manner. His documentary analysis identified 44 separate points where there was a good potential mapping of Agile practices and ISO Quality guidelines. He also provided examples of how he conducted the mapping process in order to derive his summary table of results. He then attempts to present these results in comparative bar chart form. However all he really seems to do in his presentation is to describe his results in numerical terms. He is not really highlighting key finding and attempting to explain the reasons for them or the implications of them. I.e. what does any particular important result he presents actually mean in terms of being able to develop a QMS if an organisation was moving over to XP from a traditional approach and already had an existing ISO compliant QMS for their existing traditional SE processes. After all this is what an organisation would want to know if they were in that situation and that is one of the reasons why his project is “important”.

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: 55

Comment: His final discussion is fair. He does try to take the overall results from each area of his work and discuss them in terms of his original research question. However, the level of discussion is really quite superficial and lacking in real depth. In total it is about one page for all of the 10 or so areas of the ISO guidelines. He really should have taken each ISO area and properly discussed his conclusions about the applicability of each against the specific areas of XP practices which would contribute to the development of an ISO compliant QMS. Overall his project report is a bit “short” i.e. only 40 pages and so he did have more “time and space” to do this. If I was a software development organisation interested in his project than I would want to know which XP practices related to which parts of the ISO compliant system (which he generally does provide in his evaluation). However, I would also want to know more details of where the “gaps” were and what I would have to do to “fill those in” and if I could use existing aspects of those “missing parts” from my existing non-XP based QMS. He has only very superficially alluded to this; he has not actually done any critical analysis in these areas. He has, however, made some attempt to relate his findings to other research into the area of Agile Methods and QMS. Some of his ideas for further projects which would build upon his are also not bad.

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:___ 68___

Comment: Good, this project has a clear structure and is well-written. The reader has all of the necessary “signposts” and linkages and is clear what he is doing at each stage and how each stage relates to his project.

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:___ 50___

Comment: The student was honest, put in reasonable effort, but was not really very self reliant. He had to be “led by the hand” and the core idea for structure of his dissertation and the conduct of his project methodology were all “supplied” to him by his supervisor. Ultimately he had to be taken “by the scruff of the neck” a few weeks after the Interim Report as his project was going nowhere fast!

Summary of marks for honours report

Mr X

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (65%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	60	0.05	3
Methods.	58	0.15	8.7
Results	60	0.2	12
Discussion, Conclusions and further work	55	0.15	8.25
Final Documentation	68	0.05	3.4
Student effort and self reliance	50	0.05	2.5
		0.65	Total out of 65: 37.85

Mark out of 70	Classification (%)
0-24	Fail
24.5-31	Low-med 3rd
31.5-34	High 3rd
35-38	Low 2.2 (50-55%)
38.5-41	High 2.2 (55-59%)
42-45.5	Low 2.1 (60-65%)
46-48	High 2.1 (65-69%)
49-55	1st (70-80%)
56+	1st (80-100%)

Supervisor mark (out of 65): _____ **37.85** _____

Second marker mark (out of 65): _____

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

Comment: