

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

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

**Student: The Road Runner**

**Supervisor: Richard Foley**

**Second marker: Iain Lambie**

**Honours year: 2010/2011**

**Date of report marking: \_4\_ / \_5\_ /11**

**Agreed summary of marks**

Interim report	mark out of 20	_____
Honours report	mark out of 70	_____ 57.3/70 = 82% _____
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.

<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 zero)</b>	0-39

Mark awarded:   90  

**Comment:**

**123 references in total are phenomenal as a body of supporting literature for any project. It is also a significant advance on the already outstanding 77 used at the Interim Report stage! In that respect the student had gone well beyond the comments on the original review from his Interim Report. He has also clearly expanded his discussion and depth of analysis. That said he could have covered some elements a little more concisely, e.g. there is no real need to give a lengthy informational based presentation of the W3C Mobile Web Best Practices or Nielsen's ten heuristics, but I am probably "nit-picking" here because there isn't really much at all for me to criticise!**

### ***Problem and systems analysis.***

Marks relate to the detail of the analysis of the problem the project is trying to solve. This relates not just to the application the student decides to develop, but also the analysis of the specific problem (area) which this application is trying to investigate/provide a solution for and the existing issues it is endeavouring to deal with. Marks should also relate to the clarity and completeness of the statement of functional and non-functional requirements; however these cannot simply be stated. It is expected that the student would analyse the aim 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 <sup>st</sup>	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:**   85  

**Comment:**

**There is a significant justification given for both the D&T approach as well as the stages in the specific project. It is a very well-structured approach to the Analysis (and Design, Implementation & Evaluation) of the problem all supported from the preceding literature review. The execution of the process of analysis of the existing Student Homepage is clearly systematic and rigorous, consisting of a usability inspection of the existing desktop homepage as well as an evaluation of this against the W3C Mobile Web Practices to produce a set of detailed recommendations for the mobile version and a set of key principles to guide the functional and non-functional requirements of that version. Very comprehensive indeed.**

## ***Project Design, Implementation and Testing***

**Note: In order to fully review the quality of the development's construction (i.e. project's design, implementation and testing), a demonstration of the developed application must be given by the Student to the Supervisor and 2<sup>nd</sup> Marker. This demonstration should be undertaken at a mutually agreed time and place between the submission of the report and the Poster Presentation event. This demonstration should be a demonstration of the functionality of the software. The demonstration of the functionality should be planned and driven by the student. However during and after that demonstration, the staff involved will ask questions of the development. In that questioning, the staff would expect to be able to view the source code and ask student questions relating to it and its design and testing.**

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. The student should be able to demonstrate that reasonable testing of the logic and functionality of the development has been undertaken.

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
1 <sup>st</sup>	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. The development should have significant functionality and good quality design/coding (as confirmed through the demonstration) and these aspects should be also be well-presented in the associated elements of the final report.	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 explanation of the issues involved in selecting the design and the problems experienced and how these were addressed. The development should have sufficient functionality and quality of design/coding (as confirmed through the demonstration) and these aspects should be also be clear from the associated elements of the final report	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. Again a combination of the demonstration and final report should be used to determine this grade. However, a good quality of functionality/design/implementation (as confirmed through the demonstration), but which is accompanied by a poor quality in its reporting can also still be given a grade in this range.	50-59
3	Poor. A weak solution which inadequately fits the problem/task described in the earlier sections and is weakly justified through the accompanying report. The student provides little explanation of the issues involved in selecting the design and the problems experienced and how these were addressed. If the development has at least some realistic features relating to the initial problem, reasonably coded, then one would expect a bare pass to be given, even if there was a very poor quality in the accompanying report.	40-49
Fail	Very poor. The solution does not fit the problem/task described in the earlier sections and little/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. If the student has no meaningful development to demonstrate which can reasonably be related to the initial project aim, then one would expect a grade in this range, no matter the accompanying report sections.	0-39

**Mark awarded: 78**

Richard Foley - Supervisor

**Comment:**

**The design presented is developed in a rigorous and well structured manner. Whilst it is supposedly a prototype (in the sense that it is not a “live” website) it does exhibit all of the essential features with significant functionality in a manner expected of the real-life application and could easily form the basis of a viable mobile application for the University Student Homepage. Every essential design decision is discussed, justified and clear linked back to the previous literature review and the analysis decisions. The use of W3C validation tools to provide Validation testing was a very good idea and added significant value to the overall evaluation of the system (see next section comments). The demonstration confirmed that this was a very solid development.**

### ***Evaluation, Discussion, Conclusions and further work:***

The student may have a separate Evaluation section and Conclusion section in their report, or it may be a single larger combined section. It would not, however, be expected that a D&T project would have the same in-depth (and subsequent) evaluation as other project types. However, in relation to the emphasis of the Evaluation aspect, it should be an 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 or criteria should also be discussed, presented and justified.

In terms of the Finals conclusions of the project, 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. Thorough, and comprehensive evaluation given which is clearly described, discussed and justified. There should also be 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. Critical evaluation using appropriate evaluation procedure/criteria clearly described and justified accompanied by critical discussion 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 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. Reasonable evaluation, with a clear description of the evaluation procedure/criteria but limited in their justification accompanied by discussion 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. Limited description of evaluation procedures/criteria and/or procedures/criteria inappropriate accompanied with little discussion 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. Little or inadequate evaluation described or completely inappropriate procedures adopted. Little realistic discussion 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. Little or no critical analysis of the students own work. No real discussion of further areas for development/research.	0-39

**Mark awarded: 75**

#### **Comment:**

The use of a basic end user based evaluation was an excellent idea. In a D&T project we do not expect a highly detailed empirically based evaluation. He has already undertaken a tool based evaluation and thus a subsequent discursive evaluation of that would probably have been sufficient for a “standard” project output for this element. Thus the development of an end user evaluation added to the academic rigour already shown by the student. As with all other elements of the project, this evaluation was well-developed and justified in its construction. Its results, which were both quantitative and qualitative in

Richard Foley - Supervisor

nature, were also well presented and the evaluation confirmed a well-developed system. The final chapter also exhibits a good degree of critical analysis of the overall work, including the achievement of the Research Question and Hypotheses, and identifies some useful areas of further work. He could possibly have picked out more clearly the specific use of the guidelines and thus his “top tips” for the development of functionality and user interface when migrating a desktop web site to a mobile version as these were really the “conclusions” of this project, i.e. use these as your main guide when reviewing the desktop version and you should develop a mobile version with good usability without the need for labour intensive User Centred/ Participatory Design methods.

### ***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:**

**This was an exceptionally well structured and written report. The attention to detail was very significant. All elements were complete and comprehensive. An excellent style of academic writing also exhibited.**

## **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 student consistently worked above levels normally expected. He was highly self reliant, with the degree of rigour and the volume of work undertaken outstanding.**



## Summary of marks for honours report

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (70%)	Weighted mark
Literature review update	90	0.05	<b>4.5</b>
Problem and systems analysis.	85	0.1	<b>8.5</b>
Project Design, Implementation & Testing	78	0.25	<b>19.5</b>
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	75	0.15	<b>11.3</b>
Final Documentation	90	0.1	<b>9</b>
Student effort and self reliance	90	0.05	<b>4.5</b>
		0.70	Total out of 70: 55.1

**Supervisor mark (out of 70):** 57.3

**Second marker mark (out of 70):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Agreed mark for honours project (out of 70):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Comment:**