# DS591 Dissertation 1st Marker’s Independent Marking Form

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Student Surname:*** |  | ***First name:*** | |  | Fu | | ***First name:*** | Yihao |
| ***Project Title:*** |  | |  | | |  | | | | Co-VO, A Web-based Co-design Platform for the ECA Draft Prototype |

This section is used as a guide to justify the overall mark given by the examiner. Complete it as you see fit and then select the overall grade. Please ensure consistency between these selections and the overall grade given. The scoring represents the following grade ranges: **1= fail (0-39); 2 = marginal fail(40-49); 3 = pass (50-59), 4 = merit (60-69), 5 = distinction (70-79) 6 = good distinction (80-100)**

Written Thesis and Technical Work:  
1= fail; 2 = marginal fail; 3 = pass, 4 = merit, 5 = distinction 6 = good distinction

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **N/A** |
| Quality of English |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Structure and Layout |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Background review of existing work |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical understanding of topic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Selection & application of suitable technical/research methodology |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Technical/research depth and rigour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Results and evaluation rigour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conclusion and Implications of the findings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Viva:   
1= fail; 2 = marginal fail; 3 = pass, 4 = merit, 5 = distinction 6 = good distinction

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **N/A** |
| Preparedness |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of presentation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Technical Demonstration |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critically argue and reason |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Supervisory Issues: (supervisor only)  
1 = Strongly Disagree; 5 = Strongly Agree

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **N/A** |
| Student was highly motivated |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student was able to solve technical/research problems unaided |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student worked systematically and methodically |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student’s time-management was good |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student met deadline |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student attended meetings with supervisor |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Please state overleaf whether and to what extent student progress was hindered by factors outside their control (e.g. problems with tools, personal or health problems).*

Overall Mark

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Please propose an overall mark for the project. Overleaf, please provide a rationale for the grade.  **Check the guidelines for awarding grade letters.** | | | | | Assessed Mark: | | | |  | |
| Name: |  | Role: |  | Supervisor | |  | Second Marker | Date: | |  |

**NOTE:** Comments provided below (apart form comments to the moderator) will automatically be distributed to the students; please provide detailed feedback with appropriate tone.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Summary of the objectives of the dissertation, and the extent to which they have been met**   |  | | --- | |  |   *Comments on written thesis:*  *In addition to giving comments on the thesis, if you are awarding a mark which is higher than the written thesis alone would support, please provide additional evidence on the reasons for this, e.g. student produced a short paper accepted at a conference/workshop, led to IP generation, in real world use.*   |  | | --- | |  |   *Comments on academic rigour:*  *Given the research focus of masters degrees over and above undergraduate projects, please provide commentary on the quality of the academic rigour applied to the technical or research problem.*   |  | | --- | |  |   *Comments on the Viva:*   |  | | --- | |  | |
| **Assessor:**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Name: |  | | | | Assessed Mark: | | | |  | | Date: |  | Role: |  | Supervisor | |  | Second Marker |  | | |

**MSc Marking Guide**

The dissertation is marked out of 100 as below:

**0-19 Fail**

Little, or no, evidence of any knowledge demonstrated and/or effort being made. There is no relevant technical (i.e. implementation) work delivered as part of the project.

**20-39 Fail**

Some evidence of minimal effort being applied is demonstrated. There may be a little logic or structure to the document and technical work, but and some glimpses of understanding; however, the methodologies used may be obviously incorrect or contain major omissions. Technical work is limited or non-existent.

**40-49 Marginal Fail**

There is a discernible structure and logic to the document, at least some evidence of understanding, and no blatantly obvious major mistakes or major omissions. However, the methodology is flawed and/or the research question has not been answered sufficiently well. Technical work is present but of a limited nature in its ability to answer the research question(s).

**50-59 Pass**

This should be a coherent and structured account where a research question is approached using appropriate scientific techniques. This account should be largely correct and accompanied by relevant results, and a bibliography used within the text to illustrate the argument that addresses the research question. Research techniques must have been applied and interpreted correctly and there should be some demonstration that the concepts behind the techniques have been understood. Technical work is of a reasonable standard and was sufficient to answer parts of the research question, but lacks completeness or generality or is difficult / impossible for others to use in future work.

**60-69 Merit**

As for a Pass, with some use of understanding beyond those covered in the MSc modules, and demonstrating a good conceptual understanding. The account should flow logically and be largely complete (for example, following a scientific workflow of hypothesis, background, system and experiment design, results and discussion). The conclusion should demonstrate that the work has addressed and answered the research question(s). This should be done in a competent, convincing and well-reasoned manner. Technical work is of a good standard and has been able to answer the research question fully, or is well designed and suitable for others to build upon in future.

**70-79 Distinction**

As for a Merit. In addition, the student should demonstrate mastery of an appropriate substantial body of methodology beyond the MSc modules studied. A distinction would normally demonstrate a high level of insight, understanding and clarity, including consistent use of notation, and the research question(s) should be answered logically and completely. Technical work is very strong, fully answering the research question(s) and going beyond initial expectations of the project.

**80-100** **Outstanding Distinction**

As for a Distinction. However, the writing in the report must be of publishable quality (i.e. clear, unambiguous and with good style) and the work itself should be publishable, with little modification other than making it more concise, in a reputable peer-reviewed conference or journal. Technical work is outstanding, shows excellent attention to detail and thoughtful features, is well defined as a standalone project and is easy to use or documented to a high standard, and is suitable for public release.