

School of Engineering and Computing
Computing-Based UG Programmes

Honours Project marks
Experiment/case study style project

Student: Aladdin

Supervisor: Richard Foley

Second marker: June McCrae

Honours year: 2009/2010

Date of report marking: _12 / _5 _/10

Agreed summary of marks

| | | |
|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Interim report | mark out of 20 | _____ |
| Honours report | mark out of 70 | _____46/70 = 66%_____ |
| Poster Presentation | mark out of 10 | _____ |

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. 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: 50

Comment:

To be honest there was just a little bit of improvement from the initial literature review from the interim report. This consisted of a bit of discussion about specific attributes from Neilsen's and Gerhardt-Powals' heuristics in relation to Educational Software HCI for the area and also the use of a different diagram to represent the 4 learning models for educational software. Again whilst the general writing style is good and the set of references used within the report as a whole are good (44 cited in total) it remains disappointing at only 5 pages and in retrospect I think that I was far too overgenerous in my assessment of the original literature review from the Interim Report. However there is nothing I can do about that now and so he had just "got lucky"!

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 a very good case is made for the specific HCI evaluation method used (it was fundamentally unchanged textually from the interim report and this is good as it does show how well that element was done at that time and how little refinement was required for its incorporation into the final report. The method adopted for selection of the 4 software packages has now been fully developed and that is an excellent refinement from the ideas outlined at the interim report stage. He also describes a bit of detail in relation to the structure of the usability analysis checklist he intends to use for the evaluation of the 4 packages, but to be honest this is where his comparative lack of depth from his literature review shows through. Certainly he seems to have an idea of the areas he need to evaluate and the questions he needs to answer, however where is the discussion as to how these were derived from an adaptation of Neilson's and/or Gerhardt-Powals' heuristics. Are these directly taken from specific heuristics and simply rephrased to have meaning within the context of educational software of this type? It may be, but I don't know because he hasn't told me or had any discussion relating to that. He started that section (3.2.3) by saying that the "guidelines ... [had] been reviewed and transformed into in-depth questions" but that was the last I saw of it after that as he didn't present any of this discussion relating to that (supposed) review of those heuristics when he "presented" his specific guidelines for his usability analysis. Indeed he committed the "classic mistake" of "telling me" (page 22) that I would find these details in the appendix! The appendix is for material which will "interrupt" the flow of the narrative if it is included in the main text. His derivation process is that narrative (!!!) and as such should be in the main text with some appropriate accompanying discussion. In contrast, however, there is clear rigour in this section: his use of spreadsheets for the data capture and the actual application of his selection method to identify the 4 packages show that. Thus there are some very good elements of this section, but it is "marred" a little by that lack of depth in the development of the main instrument and that, therefore, has brought down a potentially significantly higher mark.

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: 68

Comment:

From the detail of the presentation it is clear that the student has again carried out the evaluation with rigour. The fully completed checklists with the additional notes (in the appendix) simply confirm that. The results themselves are very clearly laid out and the graphs and table summarise them clearly and enable the key points to be presented. He then presents some discussion giving reasons for the results in each category for each package and again this shows his rigour in the application of the project methodology. At times I felt that he did go on a bit with the illustrations, but it will be interesting to see if he actually utilised this discussion to pick out some overall conclusions in his final chapter. It is interesting to note that in this section he has got the right “balance” between appendix and main text. You can see that his appendices A-D are the full set of “raw data” for each of the separate evaluations and that his presentation in the main body is the “summarised” and “digestible” results which he has derived from that data. This is a classic example of good presentation of (substantial) experimental results

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: 68

Comment:

Whilst he did not present a brief resume of his project (which probably you should since without it he has little critical/reflective analysis of the undertaking of his own work) his approach to his conclusions again showed very good academic rigour. Certainly his use of sources to present his general conclusions and his use of his results to determine a set of useful guidelines for this area of software was excellent. Indeed the set of guidelines was clearly “picked up” from his previous chapter which presented the results and so that was very good and they had good detail and coverage. The further work discussion also demonstrated that he student had a clear understanding of the context of the work he undertook and how it could be built upon or enhanced given more resources and time. I would have liked him to have given some conclusions in relation to the use of his “end product” i.e. this set of guidelines. To me these would give developers guidance about what to include in their development of educational software in at mathematics (but also other discipline areas), but also it would give teachers guidance about what to look for in an educational package if they were involved in the purchasing/procurement of software for their own pupils.

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: 72

Comment:

The document is very well structured, had an excellent academic style and the quality of the report clearly showed the rigour of the project. It was a slight pity about the “less comprehensive” literature review section.

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: 68

Comment:

Overall the student worked very well on the project. He was generally self-reliant in that once I explained clearly to him what was involved in a task he could pursue that with rigour and self-reliance. I found that I never therefore had to “repeat myself to him”. He may have had initial misunderstandings about an activity, and sometimes that was clear in the work he presented during the course of the project, however, once any matter was clarified to him he performed it well and clearly took on board the feedback

Summary of marks for honours report

| Section | Section mark (out of 100) | Weighting (70%) | Weighted mark |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Literature review | 50 | 0.05 | 2.5 |
| Development of Project Methodology. | 60 | 0.15 | 9 |
| Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis) | 68 | 0.2 | 13.6 |
| Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work | 68 | 0.15 | 10.2 |
| Final Documentation | 72 | 0.1 | 7.2 |
| Student effort and self reliance | 68 | 0.05 | 3.4 |
| | | 0.70 | Total out of 70: 45.9 |

Supervisor mark (out of 70): 45.9

Second marker mark (out of 70): _____

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

Comment: