School of Engineering and Computing

Computing-Based UG Programmes

Honours Project marks

Experiment/case study style project

Student: Wile E. Coyote

Supervisor Richard Foley

Second marker: Eddie Gray

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**	__51/70 = 73%_____
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
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* 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* 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* 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* 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* Little or no change and initial review section in interim report was rated Fail. **(in this case award zero)**	0-39

Mark awarded: ___72_____

Comment:

The literature review is better structured as per the Interim report feedback with greater emphasis given to the development of a set of generic criteria for the functional requirements of Batch Scheduling tools. There is also some improvement in the analysis particularly in the development of the set of generic requirement categories which a good Batch Scheduling tool should have. However, the development of a discussion which identifies an appropriate HCI method is also improved. It is more concise in the less relevant areas and has better analysis in the more relevant areas (i.e. the type of evaluation methods which are more suitable to this particular case study environment). There is the same set of literature sources but they have been better used and presented and overall a very good improvement has been made to the literature review now making it well integrated critical discussion.

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.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1st	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: __72_____

Comment:

This section gives very good detail of the process of development for the two methods employed in the primary research. It is very clear how each aspect of the requirements checklist and the HCI QUIS have been derived. There are some good linkages back to the literature review conclusions, and indeed much of that review with its supporting references led to the development structure. The method of application is also clear. It is obvious that this has been done with a very good degree of academic rigour.

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.

Grade	Description	Mark range
1st	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: __75_____

Comment:

The results are very detailed. The raw data is given in the appendices documents and it is clear that they have been appropriately collated and concisely laid out. All key findings are highlighted and there is some useful discussion of the results. The tables are clear and have been intelligently selected for relevance. Excellent!

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: ___65_____

Comment:

There was some degree of critical evaluation in the final conclusions. Certainly he reviews the extent to which the research question and hypotheses were achieved. However, I would have liked more about the possible future work and also about what these findings in general might mean for the area of batch scheduling. He really could have dwell significantly on issues such as the general nature of batch scheduling tool functionality and the areas were future tools might need to concentrate in terms of enhanced functionality and/or improved use interface.

Final Documentation:

The marks relate to: the quality of the presentation of the report (format, discursive content, analysis 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: ___80_____

Comment:

Documentation and writing style was excellent. A very clear and easy to read report.

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: ___75____

Comment:

Student was very self reliant throughout he project, he generally worked "ahead" of the supervisor, e.g. the requirements checklist for the matching exercise was done essentially "of his own bat" and substantially completed prior to the Interim Report stage. This sort of time management and effort contributed significantly to a very soundly developed and rigorously executed project.

Summary of marks for honours report

Section	Section mark (out of 100)	Weighting (70%)	Weighted mark
Literature review	72	0.05	**3.6**
Development of Project Methodology.	72	0.15	**10.8**
Results (Presentation and Initial Analysis)	75	0.2	**15**
Final Discussion, Conclusions and further work	65	0.15	**9.8**
Final Documentation	80	0.1	**8**
Student effort and self reliance	75	0.05	**3.8**
		0.70	Total out of 70: 51

Supervisor mark (out of 70): _____51_____

Second marker mark (out of 70): _____

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

Comment: