

School of Engineering and Computing
Computing-Based UG Programmes

Honours Project marks
Experimental style project

Student: Superman

Supervisor: Richard Foley

Second marker: Tom Buggy

Honours year: 2010/2011

Date of report marking: _27/_4_/11

Agreed summary of marks

Interim report	mark out of 20	_____
Honours report	mark out of 70	<u>45.1/70 = 64%</u> _____
Poster Presentation	mark out of 10	_____

Total mark out of 100 _____

Signed (Supervisor) _____ **Richard Foley** _____

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
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 (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. <i>Or</i> 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. <i>Or</i> 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. <i>Or</i> 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. <i>Or</i> Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated Fail. (in this case award zero)	0-39

Mark awarded: 65

Comment:

46 sources in total is a significant improvement from the Interim Report. Whilst his literature review is fundamentally the same as from the Interim Report, he has now incorporated citations within the text (and also in the figures). Thus this is a good improvement to the original literature review attempt, which again I think that (in retrospect) I grossly over marked by even giving it 35% at the Interim Report stage, since it had no in-text citations of any kind. I think that if that occurred this year then it would have to suffer the penalty of 0% for that element of the Interim Report to remain consistent with the marking scheme from the proposal.

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
1 st	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: 60

Comment:

As with the Interim Report the student does give the same well argued case for the use of an experimental approach and also the basic experiment's architecture. There is some further detail about the set of experiments and how they were constructed. However, rather than simply always refer to appendices; he really should have explained some of the key points of the experimental configuration within the main body of the report. Also, the set of experiments he intends to execute could have been more clearly presented, e.g. as a table with the various alternative parameters. He also just "brushes" over the metrics he will capture to make his performance judgements. This sort of thing should be in a clearly structured sub-section of its own. Thus the implementation of his physical experiments is only covered in a page and a half! Thus, overall, this section is a bit shorter than it really should be.

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
1 st	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: 62

Comment:

His results chapter is voluminous, i.e. 48 pages of the 74 pages of the complete report. The 8 separate experiments with their different configurations do suggest a high degree of rigour in the execution of the project. However it has to be asked if the results could have been presented in a more concise manner? For example, he ran each scenario 5 times and calculated an average value so that any execution variation in the experiment could be “smoothed out”. This was good, but then did he really need to give me a table/graph of the value for each run! Surely this should have been in the appendices and only the averaged figures in the main text? Also he “plots” each run value on a line graph, but each run produces a discrete value, it is not on a continuous scale over a continuous time period! Surely a histogram would have been the correct graph? Having said that, why put it on a graph at all. Again only the final averaged figures should have been included in the main body. Surprisingly he does not have a final “compare everything” table giving the same key performance measures against each experiment so that easy comparisons can be made. I found that particularly surprising since he showed me just that sort of “raw info” on a spreadsheet in a supervisory meeting I had with him! Having said all of this it is a rigorously executed experimental project and so credit must be given for that.

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
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, 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: __65__

Comment:

It is a good summary of the work and its conclusions. He relates his discussion back to the key findings of appropriate earlier sections and systematically reviews his research question and hypotheses on an evidential basis. However, whilst this is done well he could have developed areas of this final section more. For example the “Project Limitations and Future Works” section suggests the boundaries of his project work but more detail could have been given of other projects which could be undertaken to progress this work further.

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
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:

Overall this is a very well structured report. It is written with a good academic style. However, the amount of coverage of the results section when compared with the much shorter amount for the methods section does detract from the overall quality of what would have otherwise been an excellent presentation.

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: __75__

Comment:

The student was an excellent student. The project was his own idea and he required very little support technically from me. Extremely self-reliant and self-motivated

Summary of marks for honours report

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (70%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	65	0.05	3.3
Development of Project Methodology.	60	0.15	9
Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)	62	0.2	12.4
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	65	0.15	9.8
Final Documentation	68	0.1	6.8
Student effort and self reliance	75	0.05	3.8
		0.70	Total out of 70:45.1

Supervisor mark (out of 70): _____ **45.1** _____

Second marker mark (out of 70): _____

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

Comment: