

# MMP Marking Guide

The following table expands on the information in guide in the marking process. The final mark for your project will be consistent with the Formal Assessment Criteria [1], which you are advised to read carefully. The assessment is taken from different aspects of your work on the project.

<b>As judged by Mid-Progress Demonstration:</b>	
Assessment of progress at a mid-point in the project.	5%
<b>As judged from the Dissertation:</b>	
A report that discusses the preparation and problem analysis, design implementation, testing and evaluation of the project.	70%
<b>As judged by the Supervisor:</b>	
Initiative shown during the project.	5%
<b>As judged at the Interview &amp; Demonstration:</b>	
Assessment of the technical outputs and the student's insight and knowledge of the project topic.	20%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>

Note that your level of insight into the project and your overall technical achievement have a major influence on your final project mark; see the Formal Assessment Criteria document.

## Notes on the marking process

The project is double-marked. It is assessed independently by your supervisor and by another member of staff (the 'second marker'). We intend that the second marker will be the same person for all of the assessed components. This may not be possible in certain circumstances, e.g. staff illness.

The two sets of marks are then compared and if, as is usual, the two marks are very similar a final mark is agreed. If the two markers have significantly different views, the module co-ordinator will moderate the submission to help arrive at the final mark. The external examiners also examine a number of project dissertations to help check that the marking is consistent with the Formal Assessment Criteria.

## General issues considered during marking

The following list identifies the main areas that are considered during the marking process.

1. **Preparation:** how well you researched the background to the project topic, how well you understood what you read, and how well you presented it, with appropriate citations and bibliography entries.
2. **Analysis:** how well you understood the problem you addressed, how well you assessed alternative possible approaches to it and how well you justified the approach you selected.
3. **Design:** the appropriateness of the design process that you used, how well you compared the various design options, and the quality and appropriateness of the final design that you selected.
4. **Implementation & Testing:** the quality of the code you produced, its organisation, style, layout, and your use of software tools, and how well you

designed, executed, and documented the process you used for testing your system and presented the test results you obtained.

5. **Critical evaluation and Insight:** how well and in how much detail you analysed the strengths and weaknesses of the system you produced and your approach to the project. How well you demonstrate your understanding of the various aspects of the project and related topics, and the relevance of your work to the general body of work in the area.
6. **Technical Achievement:** This mark reflects the quality and capability of the system you developed, as well as the difficulty of the problems that you had to overcome in the course of the project. This issue has an impact on different parts of the project. The more difficult your project, the more marks are potentially available under different parts of the assessment.
7. **Report presentation and quality:** the way in which your dissertation is organised, including appropriate ordering of the contents, ease of reading and ease of finding specific sections, completeness, suitability of binding, and completeness of the CD-ROM or DVD-ROM. This also includes the correctness and appropriateness of the language and punctuation and the quality of diagrams, tables etc.
8. **Initiative:** how effective you were at finding relevant information, generating ideas, and putting your knowledge and experience into practice, and the extent to which you recognised the benefits of good ideas and advice provided by your supervisor.

### Document History

Date	User	Modification
20/02/2013	<a href="#">nst</a>	Added this file to the 2012-2013 website.
10/02/2014	nst/mjn	Updated for 2013-2014.
26/02/2014	nst	Updated for release.

This information is maintained by Neil Taylor, the module co-ordinator. If you have any questions about the Major/Minor Project, please contact Neil Taylor ([nst@aber.ac.uk](mailto:nst@aber.ac.uk)).

### References

- [1] Department of Computer Science, Aberystwyth University (2014) *MMP Formal Assessment Criteria for CS39440, CC39440 and CS39620*. Available electronically on the Blackboard module page.