

**School of Engineering and Computing**  
**Computing-Based UG Programmes**

**Honours Project marks**  
**Experiment/case study style project**

**Student: Penelope Pitstop (81%)**

**Supervisor: Richard Foley**

**Second marker: Eddie Gray**

**Honours year: 2007/2008**

**Date of report marking: \_\_ /6/08\_\_**

**Agreed summary of marks**

<b>Interim report</b>	<b>mark out of 20</b>	_____
<b>Honours report</b>	<b>mark out of 65</b>	<u>52.9/65 = 81%</u> _____
<b>Presentation</b>	<b>mark out of 15</b>	_____

**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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	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 <sup>st</sup> class <b>(in this case award the lower value 70)</b>	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. <b>(in this case award the lower value 60)</b>	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. <b>(in this case award the lower value 50)</b>	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. <b>(in this case award the lower value 40)</b>	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. <b>(in this case award <u>zero</u>)</b>	0-39

**Mark awarded:**    78

**Comment:**

**Whilst the original literature review was already excellent, there are still indications of improvement on the minor points made at the time. There is an increase in the number of references (75 to 82) and evidence of improvements in phraseology and writing style in the very few areas where it could have been improved upon. Again excellent!**

## ***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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	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:**      78  

### **Comment:**

**This is an excellent and complete methods section. There is significant use of supporting references and some analysis in the development of the approach. This commences with a justification for the case study approach itself as well as an analysis of the organisational situation as being typical and valid for the specific project which was proposed. It is clear to see that each element of the case study has been thoroughly planned and developed. The reasoning underlying the construction of each case study instrument is also very clear. The process and analysis of determining the selection of a metrics tool to use was also a very good touch which was another example of the high degree of rigour demonstrated throughout this section.**

### **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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	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: \_\_85\_\_**

#### **Comment:**

The results are clearly laid out and presented in a systematic manner consistent with the different aspects to the case study approach. It is also not simply a presentation but initial discussion of them and their relationship to the objectives of the project. The discussion of the results with its reference to supporting literature sources shows significant insight and understanding of them by the student. The qualitative results are presented with equal clarity to the metrics based ones, something which is often difficult as these are more subjective in nature. However, again an extremely coherent and insightful rationale is given utilising key “patterns” (through highlighted quotes) drawn out from the interview phase. Again there is significant use of references to support/relate the findings to. Comprehensive and outstanding!

### ***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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	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: 75**

#### **Comment:**

**As with all aspects of this project the treatment of final conclusions is substantial, with the final chapter consisting of 8 pages of coverage. There is a very good resume and discussion of the project in relation to both the hypothesis and research question. There are also clear references to the work of others and how her findings relate to that. The section which outlined the potential constraints of this project demonstrated a clear understanding of the nature of the project and the level of research being undertaken. Plenty of analysis is given as well as some detail of related work which could be further undertaken.**

### ***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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	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: \_\_90\_\_**

#### **Comment:**

The document as a written piece of academic work was outstanding. It was totally complete, but also had the appropriate level of detail. The quality of the writing and the academic style adopted was excellent and an exemplar of such. The specific references to pages with the appendices and the labelling of them also made it very easy to pick out detail if required as you went along.

## **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.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	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: \_\_90\_\_**

#### **Comment:**

The level of effort was significantly above those normally expected. The student was extremely self reliant, picked up on every point I made and then developed it independently. She was also extremely independent in terms of her own ideas for undertaking the project. I really didn't expect that a student at this level would utilise significant use of metrics within a case study. Similarly I found her use of an existing questionnaire framework to provide a (retrospective) measure of project risk highly innovative (and completely her own idea/finding). Every milestone of the project was achieved ahead of schedule, e.g. Case study actually undertaken by early March; complete report drafted up by first half of April.

## Summary of marks for honours report

Penelope Pitstop

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (65%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	78	0.05	3.9
Development of Project Methodology.	78	0.15	11.7
Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)	85	0.2	17
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	75	0.15	11.3
Final Documentation	90	0.05	4.5
Student effort and self reliance	90	0.05	4.5
		0.65	Total out of 65: 52.9

**Supervisor mark (out of 65):** 52.9

**Second marker mark (out of 65):** \_\_\_\_\_

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

**Comment:**