**School of Engineering and Computing**

**Computing-Based UG Programmes**

# Honours Project marks
**Develop & test style project**

---

**Student: Daffy Duck (52%)**

---

**Supervisor: Richard Foley**

**Second marker: Brian Shields**

**Honours year: 2007/2008**     **Date of report marking: __ /6/08____**

---

**Agreed summary of marks**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Interim report** | **mark out of 20** | _____ |
| **Honours report** | **mark out of 65** | __34/65 = 52%_____ |
| **Presentation** | **mark out of 15** | _____ |

**Total mark out of 100**          _____

**Signed (Supervisor)**          _____

**Signed (Second Marker)**          _____

Richard Foley - Supervisor

## *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* <br> 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* <br> 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* <br> 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* <br> 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* <br> 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:**

42 references represent a very good body of sourced literature. This is a big improvement over a very poor Interim Report version. The justification for the review and its specific objectives are also very clearly identified in the introduction chapter. The updated review itself follows a good structure and is well written. There is some degree of analysis in the writing and he attempts to draw out conclusions and justifications. However, it still lacks depth and is still only 6 pages, which is really too short. However, since the original was so bad, this is actually a good improvement and so credit should be given for that.

Richard Foley - Supervisor

## *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 |
|---|---|---|
| 1st | 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:   __58_____**

**Comment:**
**Whilst this section was short, it was clear that some degree of analysis of the specific issues of reduced functionality and HCI heuristics were being applied to derive the functionality of the prototype development. This could (and indeed should) have been more in-depth in terms of presentation. For example a more detailed discussion of the "target" application could have been presented through the presentation and discussion of lastminute.com screen shot to demonstrate the shredding features etc. There is also some element of literature based justification for some of the decisions and so some additional credit has to be given for that.**

Richard Foley - Supervisor

## *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 |
|---|---|---|
| 1st | 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: __58_____**

**Comment:**
The fact that the student does attempt to explain each aspect of the implementation is good. He attempts to justify each element of his (generally screen and functional) design. There are also occasional references to literature sources and review conclusions. It is clear that he has tried to base his implementation on a sound foundation. Again, however, with other parts of the report, there is still a lack of detail in what he presents. For example there is no detail of the overall application, its navigation structure or its overall software architecture. Certainly, though, he has implemented a reasonable amount of code (ultimately stretching to 40 pages worth of appendix), but again his design and implementation could have been better particularly in terms of depth and detail of what he should have presented.

Richard Foley - Supervisor

## *(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: __55_____**

**Comment:**

Again one could see that there was a degree of process being clearly applied to the evaluation of the development. In this case, it was the usability of the application which was being evaluated. There was some justification attempted to explain the process and its approach. Again whilst the approach was reasonable it suffered from a lack of detail on its presentation. It is clear what is being done, but there should have been more description, justification and explanation. For example, he used observation to record timings of events by participants, but glossed over the results of this in 4 lines (on page 32). One would have expected that he would have recorded the times for each main scenario task for each of the 8 participants and then presents this in some appropriate chart form.

Richard Foley - Supervisor

## *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: ___35_____**

**Comment:**
**At a page and a half it is really quite poor in the level of evaluation and analysis of the project work. It is really just a cursory overview of the project.**

Richard Foley - Supervisor

## *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 |
|---|---|---|
| 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:\_\_\_\_60\_\_\_\_\_**

**Comment:**
Generally this was good and well written. Overall the report has a good and clear structure, although of course the problem of overall depth in the sections was apparent in a number of places.

# 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 |
|---|---|---|
| 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: \_\_\_55\_\_\_\_**

**Comment:**
**The student was conscientious, and he grasped everything about the project which occurred during the discussions with his supervisor. Overall he worked hard on the project. However, his biggest problem was that he didn't put in the appropriate amount of time especially in the latter half of semester A. As a result his Interim Report had a very poor body of literature and virtually no review. Whilst he put in more like the correct amount of time from that point on in Semester B, it was clear that this game of "catch up" resulted in the rush at the end which meant that there just wasn't enough time to write a report with enough depth for higher marks. He also didn't really deal with the problems of the implementation technology and just "met them" as he encountered them in his development, rather than identify them as part of planning and solve them through some small scale coding "experiments". These are all too common problems with students!**

Richard Foley - Supervisor

# Summary of marks for honours report

Daffy Duck

| Section | Section mark (out of 100) | Weighting (65%) | Weighted mark |
|---|---|---|---|
| Literature review | 60 | 0.05 | 3 |
| Problem and systems analysis. | 58 | 0.1 | 5.8 |
| Project Design and implementation | 58 | 0.15 | 8.7 |
| (Testing and) Evaluation | 55 | 0.10 | 5.5 |
| Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work | 35 | 0.15 | 5.25 |
| Final Documentation | 60 | 0.05 | 3 |
| Student effort and self reliance | 55 | 0.05 | 2.75 |
| | | 0.65 | Total out of 65: 34 |

**Supervisor mark (out of 65):** _____**34**_____

**Second marker mark (out of 65):** _____

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

**Comment:**