

UG4/MInf projects – minor modifications

1. The following are the current exceptional criteria for assessment:

- Evidence of originality
- Outstanding scholarship and/or publishable research

The degree to which these apply to a project is an important element in determining marks in the range 70-100%.

I propose that the second of these is changed to

- Outstanding scholarship **or engineering**, and/or publishable research

to take account of projects that produce excellent software, rather than a research publication.

2. The scale of marks for the marking criteria is

not applicable / inadequate / adequate / average / good / excellent

I have not done a detailed analysis, and the marking form we use makes this difficult, but my very strong impression is that well over 50% of the marks that are given are good or excellent. The terminology “average” is therefore misleading, and any marker who attempts to make “average” their average mark is likely to be out of line with other markers. I propose that we replace “average” with “fair”.

3. Markers sometimes use “not applicable” to mean “completely absent, even worse than inadequate”, and sometimes to mean “this criterion is inappropriate for assessment of this project”. The wording needs to be clarified to make it clear that it means the latter, and then the algorithm for computing the suggested mark range needs to be checked to make sure that “not applicable” marks really are disregarded.
4. We currently require students to submit two hard copies of projects in addition to submitting electronically.

For discussion (I don’t have a strong opinion): Should we require only electronic submission?

Don Sannella
February 2019