Final agreed grade

|  |
| --- |
| **F4** |

# MSc dissertation marking/feedback form – assessment of both markers

This form should be completed *after* the viva examination. After you have circled the final grade on page 2, please also note this in the box above.

# Student details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Student name | **Muhammad Faisal** |
| Student matriculation number | **40583155** |
| Student programme | **MSC COMPUTING** |

# MSc dissertation module details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of dissertation | Data De-Duplication based on Secure Hashing |
| Submission date | 18/04/2023 |
| Supervisor | Stefano Cherubin |
| Internal examiner | Amjad Ullah |

# Viva performance

To be completed by the supervisor and the internal examiner.

(Learning outcomes 1-4 are assessed prior to the viva examination.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning outcome 5** | **Grade** | **Comments** |
| *Defend the work orally at a viva voce examination.*      Markers assess the viva performance.              Please refer to page 2 of the independent marker sheet for the grade scale. | F5 | **The student did not provide convincing evidence that he had in-depth insights about the hashing algorithm, and core concepts of his project. He demonstrated some basic understanding of some parts but mostly very generic, and inconsistent answers were given to most questions. Part of the implementation code was also not well explained.**  **Overall, the viva performance was not sufficient to convince the supervisor and the internal examiner of the authorship of the presented work.** |
| **F4** |
| F3 |
| F2 |
| F1 |
| P1 |
| P2 |
| P3 |
| P4 |
| P5 |
| D1 |
| D2 |
| D3 |
| D4 |
| D5 |

# Agreed final module mark – markers to circle grade scale for the work as a whole

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **Match to overall performance** |
| F5 | *Clear fail.* No evidence of learning outcomes having been addressed in the work completed for submission. |
| **F4** | *Clear fail.* It is possible to acknowledge that some attempt has been made to address the learning outcomes of the module, but this has been completely unsuccessful. |
| F3 | *Clear fail.* It is possible to acknowledge that some attempt has been made to address the learning outcomes of the module, but this has been largely unsuccessful. |
| F2 | *Inadequate work.* Some examples of the work showing evidence of the learning outcomes having been met, but insufficient to merit a pass grade. |
| F1 | *Marginal fail.* The work just misses the standard for a pass grade, e.g. because not *all* learning outcomes have been met. **NB in cases where *both* markers have noted *at least one* failed learning outcome, F1 is the maximum grade that can be awarded.** |
| P1 | *Bare pass.* It is possible to argue that all learning outcomes have been met. |
| P2 | *Adequate work.* It is clear that the learning outcomes have been met. |
| P3 | *Good work.* In the respect of the module learning outcomes, the work represents a good, solid performance at Masters level. |
| P4 | *Very good work.* In the respect of the module learning outcomes, the work represents a very good performance at Masters level. |
| P5 | *Very strong work.* In the respect of the module learning outcomes, the work represents a very strong performance at Masters level. |
| D1 | *Distinction.* In the respect of the module learning outcomes, the work represents an excellent performance at Masters level. The outcomes of the work completed *may merit further dissemination* in some format. |
| D2 | *Distinction.* In the respect of the module learning outcomes, the work represents an excellent performance at Masters level. The outcomes of the work completed *clearly merit further dissemination* in some format. |
| D3 | *Clear distinction.* In the respect of the module learning outcomes, the work represents an excellent performance at Masters level. The outcomes of the work completed clearly merit further dissemination and *may be worthy of publication*. |
| D4 | *Clear distinction.* The work is outstanding in meeting the learning outcomes at Masters level. The outcomes of the work completed *clearly merits further dissemination in published form*. |
| D5 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Explanation of how the markers arrived at the final agreed[[1]](#footnote-1) mark.  The final mark may occasionally be higher than both individual assessments as a result of performance at the viva. **However, the viva should not normally increase the overall mark by more than one grade**. If an overall mark more than one grade higher is recommended based on the viva then the module leader must be consulted.  **If a distinction is recommended then the markers must justify what aspect of the work merits further dissemination.**    **The examiners were in agreement**  **The examiners agreed to acknowledge some effort to present a research work. However, the complexity of the proposed work is not sufficient; the description of the proposed work is poor; the evaluation of the work is inconsistent with the proposed methodology; the viva voce performance was insufficient to prove the authorship of the presented work.** | |
| Signed by supervisor | **Stefano Cherubin** |
| Supervisor name | **Stefano Cherubin** |
| Signed by internal examiner | **Amjad Ullah** |
| Internal examiner name | **Amjad Ullah** |
| Date | **28th April 2023** |

# Resubmission details (if appropriate)

To be completed by supervisor in consultation with the internal examiner.

In the case of work awarded an overall fail grade, please list below the deficiencies to be addressed in the resubmission work. This information will form the basis of a letter to the student, as well as the resubmission marking sheet, both of which are prepared by School Office staff after the Programme Board. **\*Please type your recommendations for each learning outcome as listed below and send them to the module leader and MSc administrator\***

|  |
| --- |
| * Resubmission requirements related to Learning Outcome 1   *Conduct a literature search using an appropriate range of information sources and produce a critical review of the findings*    You must clearly identify a 1-3 research questions that can be addressed and make sure the objectives of the project are written to allow you to address the questions. Please discuss them with your supervisor first.  The literature review should  A) clearly identify what the specific issues with data deduplication are  B) clearly explain why hashing algorithms is the most suitable technique for this problem  C) provide a critical evaluation of the current systems/techniques used for data de-duplication  D) Explain the research gaps and how/what your research/project can address this.         * Resubmission requirements related to Learning Outcome 2   *Demonstrate professional competence by sound project management and (a) by applying appropriate theoretical and practical computing concepts and techniques to a non-trivial problem, or (b) by undertaking an approved project of equivalent standard.*    Discuss your methodology with specific details including requirements for your system, other research methods that you are using to complete your project and also how you are going to evaluate your project.     * Resubmission requirements related to Learning Outcome 3   *Show a capacity for self-appraisal by analysing the strengths and weakness of the project outcomes with reference to the initial objectives, and to the work of others.*    Discuss your proposed solution in the context of the literature you described – why is it different - what strength and weaknesses does it address in terms of performance/speed and security.  Provide a critical assessment of the extent to which your work meets the objectives you set out at the start         * Resubmission requirements related to Learning Outcome 4   *Provide evidence of the meeting learning outcomes 1-3 in the form of a dissertation which complies with the requirements of the School of Computing both in style and content.*      Revise the structure according to the dissertation template. Ensure to cover all essential ingredients of the dissertation. Revised references/citations according to a specific referencing style and remove all unnecessary repetition.     * Resubmission requirements related to Learning Outcome 5 *Defend the work orally at a viva voce examination.*         In the viva, you must be able to give clear explanations of questions related to your dissertation topic and should have full knowledge of all parts of the code.    Is the student required to undertake a second viva? Yes |

# Moderation notes

To be completed by moderation panel member.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Moderator | |  |
| Moderation comments | | |
| Note of action taken (if any) following moderation | | |
| Signed by moderator |  | |

1. If it is not possible to agree a mark at this stage, please contact the module leader. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)