

School of Computing and Mathematical Science

Division of Computing

Honours Project marks

Develop & test style project

Student: TinTin (39%)

Supervisor: Richard Foley

Second marker: Peter Harper

Honours year: 2006/2007

Date of report marking: __ /6/07__

Agreed summary of marks

Interim report	mark out of 20	_____
Honours report	mark out of 65	_____ 25.1/65 = 39% _____
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. 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: 60

Comment:

There is a bit missing from his conclusions (it just stops in mid-sentence)! His changes since the Interim Report are really just cosmetic. There is no enhancement since the IR stage.

Problem and systems analysis.

Marks relate to the detail of the analysis of the problem the project is trying to solve and the clarity and completeness of the statement of functional and non-functional requirements. It is expected that the student would analyse the objectives of the project and the findings of the literature review and through their discussion justify the functional and non-functional aspects of their development as appropriate and sufficient for investigating the technology and/or application which is at the core of their project's research question.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1 st	Excellent. A very clear, well structured and argued problem and systems analysis section. It provides a very clear and complete justification for the requirements incorporated within the development as well as a complete specification of requirements, both functional and non-functional. All arguments and decisions being backed up by supporting material and literature review conclusions as appropriate.	70-100
2.1	Good. A clear and well structured problem and systems analysis section. A good justification for the requirements incorporated within the development as well as a clear specification of requirements, both functional and non-functional, backed up by supporting material and literature review conclusions where appropriate.	60-69
2.2	Fair. A description of the problem and systems analysis is provided. Some justification for the requirements incorporated is presented, as well as a clear specification of requirements, both functional and non-functional. There are however some gaps in the analysis.	50-59
3	Poor. While some description of the problem and systems analysis exists it is in limited detail. The specification of requirements is incomplete and little justification is presented.	40-49
Fail	Very poor. Very limited or no description of the problem and systems analysis. Limited or no requirements.	0-39

Mark awarded: 60

Comment:

To his credit he does commence with a summary of the criteria (resulting from his literature review) which he uses to decide how his test development should be "structured". He then also takes the test-case web site and attempts an analysis (well at least a discussion with some detail, it could have been much better structured) of the existing site and makes a case for the functional (and non-functional) content of the mobile site he will develop for his project primary work and evaluation. He does refer back to the findings of his literature review as he presents this discussion.

However, his analysis could have been better presented/structured and he has no final summary/definition of his specification.

Supervisor's Marking: Richard Foley

Project Design and implementation

The marks relate to: the quality and clarity of the design of the solution (including its software architecture/technology implementation as appropriate); the clarity and detail of the explanation for the design choices; clarity of the description of problems and issues involved in the implementation. These design and implementation choices at both high and low level must be justified through reference to and appropriate combination of the problem analysis, literature review conclusions as appropriate.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1 st	Excellent. A well presented and original/innovative solution which clearly fits the problem/task described in the earlier sections and is very well supported by detailed justification of all aspects of its design and implementation, with clear and explicit linkage made to conclusions of the literature review/problem analysis. A clear and detailed explanation of the issues involved in selecting the design and the problems experienced and how these were addressed.	70-100
2.1	Good. A well presented solution which clearly fits the problem/task described in the earlier sections and is clearly justified by direct reference to the findings of the literature review/problem analysis. A clear and detailed explanation of the issues involved in selecting the design and the problems experienced and how these were addressed.	60-69
2.2	Fair. A solution which fits the problem/task described in the earlier sections with some justification given which references the findings of the literature review/problem analysis. The student provides some explanation of the issues involved in selecting the design and the problems experienced and how these were addressed.	50-59
3	Poor. A poor solution which inadequately fits the problem/task described in the earlier sections and/or is poorly justified. The student provides little explanation of the issues involved in selecting the design and the problems experienced and how these were addressed.	40-49
Fail	Very poor. The solution does not fit the problem/task described in the earlier sections and/or no justification is offered. The student provides little or no explanation of the issues involved in selecting the design and the problems experienced and how these were addressed.	0-39

Mark awarded: __25__

Comment:

He presents virtually no information about his development, neither its design choices nor implementation issues. He has only half a page, of which half of that is a poor quality screenshot with no explanation. He simply refers the reader to a URL so that we inspect it for ourselves!!!! There is not even any technical documentation, not even a code listing in the appendices!!

The URL (when followed) demonstrates that he has clearly implemented something, but the student presents no justification or explanation of its development!

(Testing and) Evaluation

The marks relate to: the quality of the design of the (testing and) evaluation strategy and its appropriateness for the specific project in question. The student has to be able to demonstrate that reasonable testing of the logic and functionality of the development has been undertaken. However, the main emphasis of this section should be on the Evaluation of the development as appropriate as a potential solution to the problem or as a means of enabling the investigation of the solution approach which is being demonstrated through the development and its application in a "realistic" setting. The development of the evaluation "instrument"/environment must also be discussed, presented and justified.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1 st	Excellent. Thorough, appropriate and exhaustive evaluation developed which is clearly described, discussed and justified.	70-100
2.1	Good. Thorough and appropriate evaluation procedures, clearly described and justified	60-69
2.2	Fair. Reasonable evaluation undertaken, with a clear description of the evaluation procedures but limited in their justification	50-59
3	Poor. Limited description of evaluation procedures and/or procedures inappropriate.	40-49
Fail	Very Poor. No evaluation/testing described or completely inappropriate procedures adopted.	0-39

Mark awarded: __35__

Comment:

He gives no detail of the construction of his evaluation or its associated data capture (i.e. questionnaire) instrument. I have no idea of the structure or format of the questionnaire; never mind what its content was based on. What were the tasks the users were asked to do in the evaluation and how does doing these tasks represent a valid or "typical" set of tasks which would provide sufficient user experience for a reasonable "judgement" of the mobility issues which the evaluation is designed to identify? How do the questions being asked relate to the guidelines concluded from the literature review?

At face value some of the questions looked "pointless". Whilst there was a clear attempt by the student to capture, present and provide some initial commentary on his evaluation results, it was a poor attempt as it had significant limitations.

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: 25

Comment:

His section is one page of text with no structure never mind depth of analysis. Very poor.

Final Documentation:

The marks relate to: the quality of the presentation of the report (both format 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: __40__

Comment:

He has not “evolved” his Interim Report introduction into one which is appropriate for a final report introduction with details of the project type/methodology or dissertation structure/synopsis. Overall his report is too short, with content “missing” and lacking in depth in a variety of 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: __60__

Comment:

The student was generally self-reliant and met all deadlines during the course of the project without any difficulty.

Supervisor's Marking: Richard Foley
Summary of marks for honours report

TinTin

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (65%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	60	0.05	3
Problem and systems analysis.	60	0.1	6
Project Design and implementation	25	0.15	3.8
(Testing and) Evaluation	35	0.10	3.5
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	25	0.15	3.8
Final Documentation	40	0.05	2
Student effort and self reliance	60	0.05	3
		0.65	Total out of 65: 25.1

Supervisor mark (out of 65): 25.1

Second marker mark (out of 65): _____

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

Comment:
