# Initial Progress Report Marking Sheet

**Student Name: Kemal Mehmet**

**Student Number:** 3810121

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Comments** | **Avail** | **Award** |
| **Introduction** | Project aims, the value of the project and the scope of the project are presented and expanded on what is included in the project proposal.  To improve:  “As a result often reports are not valued unless a player is reported greatly above the median 1, and when taken to a manual reviewer the likelihood of them being able to identify all potentially harmful communications is incredibly low.”  What is “incredibly low”? Quantify it using objective and measurable terms.  “As a result it can be speculated that the turnover of both accuracy and quantity of player reports to actual actions such as communications / game bans are incredibly low, as due to the length of audio required for a manual reviewer to listen to, cases are often not bought to manual review unless the player in question has been overly reported more so than the median, and when they are the time taken to analyse the full recording will take a large amount of time.”  Split the above paragraph into shorter sentences, each covering a specific point. Avoid the use of “incredible”, “large amount of time” and other vague terms in academic writing. Express these in a measurable way.  There is some duplication between introduction and aims section. The aim section should focus specifically on the aim of the project, without the need to repeat the problem again. | 20 | 14 |
| **Literature review** | This section is very brief – only 2 pages and there is repetition to what is already covered in section 2.2. Project value.  ’Experiments conducted demonstrate that ensemble classifier outperforms traditional machine learning classifiers by 3-5%’.  The above is quoted without any introduction or sufficient context being provided. | 15 | 8 |
| **Technical review** | Technical review lists and describes the technologies selected for the project, but research into alternatives is very limited. | 15 | 7 |
| **Implementation plan** | Development methodology is mentioned – Agile with 2-week sprints, but no evidence of research is provided.  Report writing is not broken down into specific tasks and is only planned for 2 weeks at the end of the project, which is not realistic.  Gantt chart is presented and described, which shows the tasks involved have been considered.  Consider moving the task that will make the application run at the beginning, and leave the GUI for later. In this way if you are out of time you will still have a demo to run, rather than a hollow GUI. | 30 | 15 |
| **Standards** | Overall the report specification is addressed. Use of good English language and grammar, with some improvements needed. Logical structure to chapters but avoid repetition. Good presentation of the report. Citations and presentation of references need to be improved. In specific:   * footnotes should not be used for references. All references should be used with Harvard referencing style * when using footnotes to provide some detail that was not suitable for the text, use it only the first time you encounter (e.g. multiple footnotes giving the same footnote “toxic”) * move all of these to your reference list * reference list must be ordered in alphabetical order by surname of the author * double check the formatting of your reference list   Other areas to improve:   * split long paragraphs into several sentences, each covering a specific point * proofread your report. | 20 | 12 |
| **Total** |  | 100 | 56 |

**MARKING CRITERIA ARE GIVEN BELOW FOR MARKER'S REFERENCE**

# Marking Criteria

As mentioned above, the main criteria being assessed is the professionalism, time-management and self-organisation of the student. Thus the marking scheme focuses not on the content of the project but on the progress made and the procedures applied.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Introduction** | Demonstration that the student has a clear grasp of the project aims, the value of the project, the scope of the project and that an appropriate the interpretation of the proposal has been developed. Simple reiteration of the proposal itself is inadequate; expansion and scoping of the ideas should be present. | 20 |
| **Literature review** | Demonstration that steps have been taken to perform a proper review of expert opinion regarding the subject area in order to contextualise and justify the value of the proposal. The review should be both broad, consulting multiple referenced sources, and focused, relating each point to the specifics of the project in hand. However, as a draft chapter it can be less comprehensive than expected for the final report without incurring a corresponding penalty to marks here. | 15 |
| **Technical review** | Demonstration that steps have been taken to perform a proper technical review that considers technologies, platforms and architectures that could be used to implement the project, identifying the relevance, advantages and disadvantages of them and drawing conclusions as to what is suitable for use. The review should be both broad, not omitting relevant technologies, and focused, clearly identifying the significance to the specifics of the project in hand. However, as a draft chapter it can be less comprehensive than expected for the final report without incurring a corresponding penalty to marks here. | 15 |
| **Implementation plan** | Clearly thought out and detailed plan for completing the work of the project including technical development methodology and report writing as specific activities. Realistic and viable. Demonstration that scale of overall work and specific tasks involved have been properly considered. | 30 |
| **Standards** | Properly addressing the report specification. Use of good English language and grammar. Logical structure to chapters. Clear narrative voice in expression of arguments and information. Appropriate use of diagrams. Presentation of the report. Proper use of citations and presentation of references. | 20 |
| **Total** |  | 100 |

# Word Count

The suggested word count for the report is between 2000 and 4000 words. Much of this will depend on how complete the literature and technical review chapters are. These chapters are indicated to be *draft* chapters because similar chapters will be required in the final report and the text used in this report can be reused in the final report. Please note that these chapters will be assessed to a stricter criteria when the final report is marked as no allowance will then be made for the draft status, so you may receive fewer marks for these reviews if they remain incomplete at that time. To a lesser extent, the introduction could also be considered to be a draft, but the introduction to the final report will probably need a substantial rewrite to reflect the content of the final report.