

School of Engineering and Computing
Computing-Based UG Programmes

Honours Project marks
Develop & test style project

Student: Yosemite Sam

Supervisor: Jon Sykes

Second marker: Richard Foley

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	_____ 26.1/70 = 37% _____
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: 40

Comment:

The literature review is textually identical and has not been changed since the Interim Report. It remains a basic and descriptive overview of areas related to Augmented Reality (AR) rather than a proper critical analysis of a wide range of literature sources. Overall with only 14 cited sources it just isn't good enough as a literature review. It is probably only because the overview makes some sense in itself that he hasn't been zeroed for this element, given that he hasn't added anything at all since his Interim Report 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: __35__

Comment:

His description of the actual proposed implementation is rather limited. Since this is a Computer Games project, I would have expected some story boards or similar to outline the type of functionality he envisaged implementing. He makes brief comment in relation to Mario Kart type functionality, but I would have expected a proper analysis of this. E.g. Some screen shots of Mario Kart and some detailed discussion about which features to incorporate and how the Augmented Reality aspect could be incorporated within those selected. It all seems very "half hearted" when he describes it and so this suggests a lack of detailed analysis and consideration. He seems to have just taken some brief ideas and then "starts". Possibly this is one of the reasons he ends up not implementing most of the Augmented Reality features in his final implementation. Like much of his report it is very poor in style and very "hard going" to make any sense out of it. After reading his section on his proposed functionality I still haven't really got any clear idea exactly what it is that he is going to implement. What about the use of diagrams and drawing to illustrate things?

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: ____40____

Comment:

His design/implementation sub-section looks “lengthy” (at face value) and it is obvious (from his appendices) that some amount of coding has been developed/utilised (even if not all of it is actually used, presumably since a lot of the AR wasn’t fully implemented). And some credit has to be given for this attempt at implementation since software development is what his degree is all about! Indeed it is probably only for this reason that I have passed this section since after all his whole project was all about Augmented Reality and he ended up not actually really implementing any AR? Indeed when I look at his “reasons” in this section for not incorporating the core aspects of Robot and webcam, they seem to be due to his lack of ability in programming, problem solving and poor project management. Thus am I really justified in passing this section? Anyway notwithstanding that, a lot of the description given mainly consists of “trivia” (see general comment under Final Documentation). Surely there should be some software architecture presented, some design diagrams, class diagrams, and then each distinct element of code could be properly explained. The actual implementation has several aspects of the AR missing. As with a lot of this report, his poor writing style is hampering any potential “quality” coming through. I had better move on, because if I think about this anymore I will just end up going back and lowering his mark for this section!

(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: 25

Comment:

I would have expected at the very least that his evaluation would have consisted of a descriptive “walk through” of playing the game. E.g. this would have a number of screen shots which would lead you through the game and explain the various aspects of AR implemented. Thus the reader would get a clear “feel” for the game. Again, with his poor reporting style, he has none of this and I really have little idea how “good” or otherwise his development is and how well or otherwise it demonstrated the validity and/or potential of AR. For the basic testing, he comments on having written up test cases for all of the code, but he doesn’t present any evidence of this, e.g. the list of test cases which were written (in his appendices). All he really gives is a rather inadequate description of a few of the “failings” of his low level coding

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: 35

Comment:

This continues with the same poor reporting style of the whole report. He continues to tell me (now for the third time!) all the trivia about setting up boxes and objects which don't work until he identifies some simplistic programming issue. He says that he didn't use the robot due to "lack of time", I think that it was more lack of ability – there was plenty of time for the project! Overall thus, his "conclusions" are really quite superficial and not particularly meaningful.

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:

Whilst the amount written looks quite impressive (it is actually double spaced though), the writing style is actually poor. It is less like a piece of academic work and more like a very low level “live” commentary of what he was doing. He has a lot of “repetition” in what he is saying and talks about “trivia” such as adding print statements for tracing and not knowing how to set up command listeners. Amazingly he has no diagrams, no screen shots (within the main report), no tables. Really it is as if he is trying to describe the very fine detail of something and putting a blindfold on you at the same time so that you have no idea of the overall “picture”.

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: 55

Comment: It is very difficult to judge the effort of this student. He seems to have poor overall self reliance but his appendices do suggest some coding effort. However his lack of technical overview and description of the design and implementation of the code suggests to me that a lot of it may be “standard” code from other sources. Anyway I think that I am giving him the benefit of the doubt here. This project has to be viewed as very poor, possibly he might get enough from his Interim Report and Poster Presentation to “squeeze” a pass, but does he really deserve it, that are so many “failings” in both the project and its reporting!

Summary of marks for honours report

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (70%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	40	0.05	2
Problem and systems analysis.	35	0.1	3.5
Project Design and implementation	40	0.15	6
(Testing and) Evaluation	25	0.10	2.5
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	35	0.15	5.3
Final Documentation	40	0.1	4
Student effort and self reliance	55	0.05	2.8
		0.70	Total out of 70: 26.1

Supervisor mark (out of 70): _____

Second marker mark (out of 70): _____ **26.1/70** _____

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

Comment: