

School of Computing and Mathematical Science

Division of Computing

Honours Project marks

Experiment/case study style project

Student: Professor Plum (69%)

Supervisor Richard Foley

Second marker: Jim Paterson

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	_____ 44.8/65 = 69% _____
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: ___69___

Comment: This is a very good improvement from the Interim Report stage. He has used the material and taken on board the comments about structure so that it is focussed specifically on the areas which he intends to conduct his HCI evaluation on. It is also written much more in the form of a “proper” review of the literature and there is a clear attempt to analyse and discuss the material.

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: 72

Comment: The student gives a good basic description of the 3 evaluation techniques he uses. It is also very good to see that he chose several so that triangulation could occur. It was also good to see that part of his justification was that the first two (Expert and Student) would actually help to refine the 3rd method (Children's evaluation using think-aloud) since conducting evaluations using children throws up a whole set of different problems for which preparation is essential. Apart from justifying each of the methods, he does provide some good critical discussion and clear justification using literature sources. Thus the method(s) used were presented in a very sound manner indeed. It was also clear to see that the structure and content of the evaluation methods and their evaluation instrument(s) were clearly founded on the review of his literature and its conclusions. To be honest I would have liked just a bit more explicit detail about the structure and content of the Guidelines Analysis form which he used for the core of his evaluation(s). However, the way in which he presented and discussed his approach and the detail of his methods is a good exemplar for all students.

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: 68

Comment: Overall the results were presented quite well. I do think, however, that the Expert and Student comparative bar charts should have had their scales “equalised” so that the comparative elements could be more clearly distinguished in scale terms. Also his use of pie charts at the end didn’t seem to me to serve a useful purpose. The summarising of them in a table on the next page in that section was much more useful. However, the student did pick out and tried to explain the key aspects of his results. He made the occasional linkage back to the literature review, but also drew out general points in terms of the lessons which should be drawn for the development of a better HCI in this type of software. This is precisely the purpose of performing this kind of investigative research project!

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: 65

Comment: The discussion he started in the presentation of his results when he tried to draw out some key points was continued initially in the discussion section of his final chapter. The actual reflective critique on his conduct of the project process was also very insightful. However, I was disappointed that he did not “follow through” the discussion of these results and gave me more detail about what they “meant” (in his judgement) for the topic of HCI in children’s educational software. His initial “question”/hypothesis (although he didn’t actually explicitly identify his research question!), which drove the project, contended that typical educational software for that age group had substantial usability problems. His evaluation did clearly achieve an answer to that and did so in an academically sound manner. However, to be “excellent” I would have expected that he would have drawn together an explicit and detailed set of usability issues (in this final chapter) which he had found and provided an explicit set of usability guidelines which could be used by developers to guide better software in this area and also to be used by teachers when evaluating educational software with a view to purchasing/using it with their pupils. To a great extent such an approach could have contributed significantly to a better discussion of the sort of future work which could follow on from his results and which he should have provided in greater detail.

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: ____ 62 ____

Comment: The structure of the report is good and all elements are complete. Some of the sub-sectioning could have been improved. E.g. in his literature review he could have done with sub-sub-headings when discussion specific sub-aspects of (for example) design heuristics. Also there are more grammatical errors within the text than I would expect in a final report.

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: ____ 80 ____

Comment: Generally the student was self-reliant. The project initial idea was his, finding the software was through his initiative as was making the contact with the school for the child-based evaluation. All of these logistical aspects showed independence and maturity. He was guided in the general process of the project via supervisor meetings, but he clearly took on board the points made to him and has actually produced a significant amount of actual project work and associated data collection. There is also no doubt that the overall amount of evaluation work undertaken by him was substantial and more it was clear that it had been done with significant rigour.

Summary of marks for honours report

Professor Plum

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (65%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	69	0.05	3.5
Methods.	72	0.15	10.8
Results	68	0.2	13.6
Discussion, Conclusions and further work	65	0.15	9.8
Final Documentation	62	0.05	3.1
Student effort and self reliance	80	0.05	4
		0.65	Total out of 65: 44.8

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): 44.8

Second marker mark (out of 65): _____

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

Comment: