

School of Engineering and Computing
Computing-Based UG Programmes

Honours Project marks
Experiment/case study style project

Student: Prof Pat Pending

Supervisor: Richard Foley

Second marker: Peter Harper

Honours year: 2008/2009

Date of report marking: ____ / ____ /09

Agreed summary of marks

Interim report	mark out of 20	_____
Honours report	mark out of 70	_____ 38.6/70 = 55% _____
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: 58

Comment:

There are now more sources (45 to 28 at the Interim Report). General coverage is also greater (the review is 13 pages rather than the 4 from the Interim Report. However, despite this good improvement it is still not focussed very well since again he has not identified any objectives in his introductory section. He listed 9 “objectives” in his intro, but these were more steps in the project and there was no elaboration of them. And in any case he didn’t follow any of that structure in his review. He should have had 3 basic sections for his review if he had followed that, starting with a review of the use of games within education, but he doesn’t do that anyway. Thus he has 12 separate and “flat” sections in his review. Thus not really as good an improvement as he could have accomplished.

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:

Whilst this section of the report is clearly thin on detailed analysis and presents it at more of an overview level, it is clear that the student has developed a basic method framework of utilising Cognitive Walkthrough, a post-use Heuristic/Usability evaluation and an Expert/Teacher based evaluation. It is also clear that some limited attempt has been made to relate these approaches to some relevant literature and also to demonstrate how the evaluation questions were derived/adapted. Thus there is, if not significant rigour, at least a clear method in the conduct of his primary research which has a sound grounding, and that has to be seen as good (although possibly I am being a little generous by “edging” him into the 2.1 category for this aspect.

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: 50

Comment:

I found it both mature and interesting that the student found that the cognitive walk through with the children was actually not very useful and his decision to terminate it was a sound one. It is an interesting lesson about that type of approach with that type of client group. It will be interesting to see if he picks up on that in his overall conclusion. Possibly other research might have indicated that observation as a technique is better with young children.

However, the presentation of the results does lack a bit of quality and clarity. The post-use results of the children were simply presented as a text narrative and as a monologue, i.e. with no “Easy to grasp” tables, no subsection headings. It was also simply a presentation of the responses given by the children, there was no attempt to discuss any of the results in terms of what they meant to the quality of the HCI etc. This was the same with the equivalent Teacher’s evaluation.

The Druin’s Usability aspect of the post-use evaluation was presented in a tabular form. The attempt at a radar graph was a good idea (although this could have been explained or referenced). But again it is just presenting results (albeit quite well presented); there isn’t really any significant commentary (initial or otherwise) on these 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: 55

Comment:

There was no overall resume of the project and whilst there was some discussion about the results, it was the sort of discussion which should have taken place in the previously section. Thus, whilst it is good that that element of commentary was evident, this section did not draw these points together. It could have been much more specific in coming to conclusions about the package in relation to its good or otherwise use of the HCI heuristics and then generalise those to discuss if using some of those heuristics might be the “way forward” for edutainment software aimed at a similar audience. Again this section was a bit “light” on discussion, but I did find it interesting that he learned from his experience that his data gathering techniques and instruments were to some extent lacking in structure and focus. He also didn’t actually relate his results to his research question. Indeed he never gave me an overall conclusion about how good (or otherwise) the HCI of Brain Training was! He didn’t suggest any future projects but just indicated that he acknowledged that the lack of “quality” in his project started from his lack of attention/effort in the literature review stage and focussing it towards the project with a proper depth of effort. In that sense he was just like “Daffy Duck”. His basic methodological framework was okay, but his “quality” of execution was lacking. A “higher” mark given however, since he included the initial discussion of the results here when it was marked down in the previous section.

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: ____55____

Comment:

It is generally quite a well written report in the sense that it communicates the story well and the stages in the execution are clear. However, it does have a lack of coverage and depth in some key areas.

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: ____58____

Comment:

The student clearly understood the points made in supervisory meeting and took these on board as best he could “after the event”. But often by then “the horse had bolted” and it was difficult for him to make up ground due to the less than adequate effort he put into the earlier stages.

Summary of marks for honours report

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (70%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	58	0.05	2.9
Development of Project Methodology.	60	0.15	9
Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)	50	0.2	10
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	55	0.15	8.3
Final Documentation	55	0.1	5.5
Student effort and self reliance	58	0.05	2.9
		0.70	Total out of 70: 38.6

Supervisor mark (out of 70): 38.6

Second marker mark (out of 70): _____

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

Comment: