School of Engineering and Built Environment

Computing-Based UG Programmes

Honours Project marks
Experimental style project

Student: Student BB (64%)

Supervisor: Pete Barrie

Second marker: Richard Foley

Honours year: 2011/2012   **Date of report marking: _27_ /_4_/12**

Agreed summary of marks

Interim report	mark out of 20	_____
Honours report	mark out of 70	___44.5/70 = 64%_____
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 <u>zero</u>)**	0-39

Mark awarded: __63_____

Comment: 43 sources used (41 at Interim Report) and some slight structural presentation changes. Literature review still basically the same as the IR stage which was good.

Richard Foley 2nd Marker

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: __62_____

Comment: There is an attempt (which has elements of rigour) to identify a reasonably sized set of key password policy attributes which could be used to assess the "security" of an organisations password policies for on-line accounts. Similarly the process of sourcing and selecting the very large number (approx 150) is also undertaken in a systematic manner. However, I would have expected a little bit more detail of the nature of the sites selected. There isn't even a reference to the appendix containing the list of these sites. I also felt that the section in this chapter detailing with Analysis of the resultant data did not have the required level of detail to get a grasp of how she was approaching the detail of that analysis. It still seemed to be of the level of the Interim Report stage (even although she had obviously undertaken further work in determining what she was going to do subsequent to that stage). Thus to me it was a clear approach and was obviously systematic (particularly the construction of the attributes to me "measured", but it could have done with more detail in the latter parts dealing with the practicalities of undertaking the experiment and analysing the results.

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: __59_____

Comment: The results for the individual attributes were quite well presented and there was some discussion of them. However, I would have expected that the overview of the results which were presented later in the chapter would have been much more detailed and analytical in their presentation and discussion. Ultimately it was simply a short paragraph (section 4.3) and that was dissapointing. With all metrics, one would have expected some kind of combined presentation of the results of each metric set from each individual website which could then be shown as graphs or "top ten" tables of websites from different subcategories within the set of (almost 150) sites. These could also have been analysed against each of the three web site categories and then there could have been a more detailed analysis of some of the top "performers" (both in terms of good and bad overall policy implementation) and these results could have been assessed in terms of the requirements of the category or some element of good practice from the literature. She has a lot of that as "raw" data in appendices, but really good analysis is all about collating "raw" data into meaningful categories/sub-category summaries. Whilst she has that (in the main body) of this chapter for each individual usage of each of the 13 individual attributes, she does not have a similar level of analysis and discussion for password policy strength in terms of collective sets for individual web-sites.

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: ___64_____

Comment: There is some critical evaluation of the project in the final chapter, although not explicit (sourced) reference to the work of others. There is also a reasonable coverage of future possible areas of work and conclusions which suggest the possible implications for the industry/users of her findings.

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: ____68_____

Comment: Generally well written, well structured and covered all sections (although a few bits thinner that I would have liked). Good style of academic writing.

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: __75_____

Comment:

Richard Foley 2nd Marker

Summary of marks for Honours Report

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (70%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	63	0.05	**3.2**
Development of Project Methodology.	62	0.15	**9.3**
Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)	59	0.2	**11.8**
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	64	0.15	**9.6**
Final Documentation	68	0.1	**6.8**
Student effort and self reliance	75	0.05	**3.8**
		0.70	Total out of 70: **44.5**

Supervisor mark (out of 70): _____

Second marker mark (out of 70): ___**44.5**_____

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

Comment: