**CS4525/CS4527 – Single/Joint Honours Project Report Marking Form**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student:** |  | | |
| **Project:** |  | | |
| **Marker:** |  | Moderator? (put x in box if moderator) |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| INDIVIDUAL MARK |  | (CGS) |

# FINAL MARK (agreed between 1st and 2nd marker, OR moderator’s mark)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **OVERALL MARK** |  | (CGS) |

|  |
| --- |
| Comments on reaching agreement (not required if individual marks already in same band): |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. The first and second markers must complete this form electronically, individually and **independently**, and return it to the undergraduate teaching secretary by the deadline. Once all individual marks have been returned and recorded, the markers will then be asked to meet to agree a final mark. 2. Markers are not expected to fill all pages, but rather fill the Bottom-up Checklistand then to focus on the page or pages which have the criteria matching the project under consideration. After filling the small boxes the marker makes a judgement about the overall classification and fills the large justification box at the bottom of that page. 3. If the individual marks (OVERALL MARK) **are in different grade bands** (i.e. the A, B, C… grade bands), then the markers must use the box provided to comment on how they reached an agreement. Markers should argue their case and try to determine if one needs to change their position. 4. If the markers cannot agree on a mark, then a moderator shall be called in. The moderator must not have been involved in supervising the student. The moderator will look at the project materials and the original marking sheets, and may discuss the project with the two markers but not the student’s supervisor. The moderator’s mark, which must fall within the original two marks, is the mark that will be presented to the exam board. |

**Bottom-up Checklist** Write A, B, C, D, E, F, or G. in each box, or leave blank if not applicable to this project

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Communication** | |  | **Knowledge** | |
| Easy to understand explanation of technical material |  |  | Breadth and depth in knowledge of relevant up-to-date literature |  |
| Diagrams and tables used adequately (referred to in the text and explained) |  |  |
| Writing clear, concise, and with good English and no typos |  |  | Literature critically evaluated |  |
| Dissertation sensibly structured into chapters and sections |  |  | Clear understanding of project area/research topic and relevant concepts |  |
| References to literature and URLs follow a standard and are consistent |  |  |
| Quality of the presentation/demo |  |  | Appropriately reviewed competing technologies and/or products in the marketplace |  |
| Project described in sufficient detail to make it easy for someone else to replicate the system |  |  |
| User manual:   * Written in a direct and clear language; * Task-oriented descriptions (e.g. “To open a file you click on…”); and * Walk-through descriptions using detailed examples (e.g. “To enter customer Joe Bloggs with Address… do…”) |  |  | Sophistication of the knowledge applied in the project and topic investigated to an appropriate depth:   * Basic level 1, 2 knowledge (CGS C or lower); * Advanced level 3, 4 knowledge,  or knowledge of comparable complexity (CGS B); or * Knowledge beyond that taught in courses, and of advanced complexity (CGS A) |  |
| Maintenance manual:   * Installation instructions; * Description of third-party software required and where to get it from; * List of packages and files and what they are for; and * Description of how the system can be changed for most likely future adaptations and extensions. |  |  |
| Student has acquired a deep understanding of the topic |  |
| **Overall: Communication** |  |  | **Overall: Knowledge** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Work Done** | |  | **Evaluation** | |
| Appropriately consulted users of the proposed system |  |  | Evaluation quality (appropriate type of evaluation, manner in which it was conducted) |  |
| Appropriately analysed and defined the requirements for the project |  |  | Clear results |  |
| Design of the system and justification for design decisions, and evidence that alternatives were considered |  |  | Explanation of problems and difficulties found |  |
| How well the implementation works (as judged from the description in the dissertation, and the demo) |  |  | Demonstrates understanding and interpretation of results and their significance |  |
| Sophistication and difficulty of the software (or conceptual) implementation as judged from the description in the dissertation, and the demo |  |  | Critical evaluation of the project relative to the achievements of related work |  |
| Programming (or modelling) style and quality (e.g. efficient, reusable, modular, clear, well commented code) |  |  | Personal reflection of what has been achieved and not achieved in the project |  |
| Thoroughness of software testing as judged from the description in the dissertation (e.g. software tested for exceptions, scalability) |  |  | Future work suggestions |  |
| **Overall: Work Done** |  |  | **Overall: Evaluation** |  |

**First Class, CGS A1-A5**: Criteria (not all criteria need to be met to earn this grade)

Identifies and addresses a challenging problem (e.g. a research question in CS, or a business need not currently addressed)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Shows depth of knowledge and investigation in one area of CS (e.g. complexity analysis, machine learning area, knowledge representation, etc.) well beyond what’s taught in the degree

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **if yes, which area?** |  |  |

Shows breadth of knowledge, apparent in the use of critical apparatus to justify choices and decisions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Up to date with appropriately recent literature in this area, and shows good knowledge and critical analysis of competing approaches/technologies

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Novelty in the solution to the problem

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Thorough scientific evaluation (such that it might qualify for acceptance as a workshop paper), either by experimental results, mathematical proofs, or user study

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Excellent presentation, clearly explaining the technical material

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Give a justification for why you feel this is an A project, and not a B. (30 words at least)** |

**Upper Second Class, CGS B1-B3**: Criteria (not all criteria need to be met to earn this grade)

Demonstrates competence in addressing a problem, e.g. by competent design, programming, testing, or by other approaches. The project demonstrates that the student can be given a reasonably demanding computing problem and can be expected to solve it.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Shows depth of knowledge in some area of CS that is comparable in complexity with what is taught in levels 3 and 4 of the degree, and the student is able to apply that knowledge to a problem.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **if yes, which area?** |  |  |

Shows good knowledge and critical analysis of competing approaches/technologies

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Very good evaluation, either by experimental results, mathematical proofs, or user study

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Very good presentation, clearly explaining the technical material, with good organisational structure, but allowing for some minor slips such as typos

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

No major gaps in any of the “big 4”: communication, knowledge, implementation, evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Give a justification for why you feel this is a B project, and not an A. (30 words at least)**  **Give a justification for why you feel this is a B project, and not a C. (30 words at least)** |

**Lower Second Class, CGS C1-C3:** Criteria (not all criteria need to be met to earn this grade)

The project competently solves a problem of moderate complexity, using standard   
techniques. The problem and the techniques are not very advanced.

**or**

The project attempts to solve a challenging problem, but fails to solve it adequately.

The project fails to demonstrate that the student can very competently solve a demanding or more complex computing problem.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Shows good knowledge of central computing concepts (e.g. data structures, algorithms, programming languages), but fails to demonstrate a strong grasp of more advanced CS concepts (e.g. failure to make use of the more advanced concepts taught in courses). Or if using advanced concepts, demonstrates lack of depth and understanding.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Shows fair knowledge of competing approaches/technologies, but with some shortcomings in the depth of understanding demonstrated by the critical analysis, or in the breadth of coverage.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Moderately good evaluation, but with, for example, weak or incomplete experimental results, mathematical proofs, or user study

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Presentation shows some minor weaknesses, e.g. in organisational structure, or in missing parts, or difficult to follow explanations or diagrams

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Give a justification for why you feel this is a C project, and not a B. (30 words at least)**  **Give a justification for why you feel this is a C project, and not a D. (30 words at least)** |

**Third Class, CGS D1-D3**: Criteria (not all criteria need to be met to earn this grade)

The project partially solves a problem. It has shortcomings in: (a) only a simple case of the problem can be tackled; or (b) the solution only partially works, or significant cases have been neglected, which could be due to weakness in the design, implementation or testing. The project fails to demonstrate the ability to give a **complete** solution to a computing problem of moderate complexity.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Shows some knowledge of competing approaches/technologies, but with significant shortcomings in, for example, weak analysis or gaps in coverage

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Weak or incomplete evaluation, which may be represented by weak or incomplete experimental results, mathematical proofs, or user study

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Presentation quite weak and lacking effort (e.g. lacking illustrative examples), and, possibly, sloppy presentation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Give a justification for why you feel this is a D project, and not a C. (30 words at least)**  **Give a justification for why you feel this is a D project, and not an E. (30 words at least)** |

**Fail, CGS E1-E3**: Criteria (not all criteria need to be met to earn this grade)

Shows a distinct failure to solve a problem.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Shows a distinct lack of understanding of computing concepts that should be known, given what is taught in the degree

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **if yes, which area?** |  |  |

Lack of analysis of competing approaches/technologies

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Failure to evaluate the work produced

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Serious weaknesses in presentation, e.g. very poor explanations, and poor overall organisational structure

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Give a justification for why you feel this is an E project, and not a D. (30 words at least)** |

**Fail (poor or very poor) Class: CGS F1-G3**: Criteria (not all criteria need to be met to earn this grade)

Fails to demonstrate basic knowledge of computing concepts that should be known, given what is taught in the degree

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

Major parts of project missing

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Mark here if yes** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Give a justification for why you feel this is an F/G project, and not an E. (30 words at least)** |