A new structure for the MIInf project was approved by BoS on 7 November 2012. Specifically:

- Starting with the academic year 2013–14 the MIInf4 project will consist of a single 40 point course called MIInf Project (Part 1).
- Starting with the academic year 2014–15 the MIInf5 project will consist of a single 40 point course called MIInf Project (Part 2).

It is therefore necessary to produce new marking forms, guidance and assessment notes. These are given in this document and approval is sought. The agreed mark and moderation forms will be the same as those for UG4 (apart from the headers) and are not shown here.

The forms and documents are based closely on the existing UG4 ones but with some necessary changes and additions; recent comments from the external examiners have been taken into account as have comments from the UG4 projects organiser. For the marking forms, the differences with UG4 are only in the headers and initial section (Basic Criteria). Changes introduced as a result of comments from the external examiners include:

1. Changing the ‘General comments’ box to one entitled ‘Comments on the Criteria’ requiring markers to justify ratings, including comments on research and background, planning and design, realisation and implementation, and evaluation.

2. Moving the mark box so it follows the ‘Comments on the Criteria’ box. Alongside this there will be a box showing the range of marks deduced by the system from the assessment criteria and marking guidelines.

3. A new box entitled ‘Comments on the Mark’, where a marker can make general comments; a marker who awards a mark outside the range is required to justify it.

The guidance and the assessment notes are the same for both parts of the project, this serves to remind markers that it is a two part process. In fact the Projects Notes for Guidance are the same as those for UG4 and a common file will be used. Underlined text indicates a link that will be used for the online versions. The formatting here is only an indication and the current online style will be kept.

Transitional arrangements are employed for MIInf5 for the academic year 2013–14 since it is under the old structure. In effect all this means is that the forms and guidance for it will be left unchanged with the new ones introduced for the academic year 2014–15.
Note to moderators (and 1st and 2nd markers)

The project is marked on the basis of the dissertation with clarification provided by the demonstration. Therefore considerations of how well the student worked and/or how nice the student’s code was, cannot be used to alter the mark. This is particularly important for moderators to bear in mind - they must adjudicate without giving credit to considerations of this kind. It is acceptable to take into account (in the case of an unclear report, say) whether or not the code exists and/or particular tasks were completed (this is information which should be clear from the demo, or could in extreme cases be checked in the directory of supporting material submitted with the dissertation).

Notes for Guidance

Your ultimate aim is to allocate an overall numerical mark on the University-wide scale:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ord.} &< 40\% \leq \text{III} < 50\% \leq \text{II}.2 < 60\% \leq \text{II}.1 < 70\% \leq \text{I} \\
\end{align*}
\]

To arrive at a mark, follow the guidelines given below. These refer to the criteria listed in the Assessment report Form.

0-19: Bad Fail
The project is inadequate in each of the basic criteria.

20-29: Clear Fail
The project is inadequate in more than one of the basic criteria, but not all.

30-39: Marginal Fail
The project is inadequate in one of the basic criteria.

40-49: III
The project is adequate on each of the basic criteria.

50-59: II.2
The project is at least average on each of the basic criteria and is average on most of the additional criteria.

60-69: II.1
The project is at least good on each of the basic criteria and is at least average and sometimes good or excellent on each of the additional criteria.

70-79: Low I
The project is good or excellent on all the basic and additional criteria.
80-89: High

The project is good or excellent on all the basic and additional criteria and also has elements of the exceptional criteria.

90-100: Outstanding

The project is excellent on all the basic and additional criteria, and has strong elements of the exceptional criteria.

Interpreting the criteria

Many projects will not fit neatly into any category, e.g. strong on additional criteria, but weak on a basic one. In this case you are asked to trade one criterion off against another as best you can, bearing in mind that failure on a basic criterion is a serious fault.

The aim of the project is to teach sound scientific and engineering methodology. The project should be assessed on the evidence that these have been demonstrated. The criteria for assessing the work of the project are given separately and are divided into basic, additional and exceptional.

Independent marking

Your mark should be arrived at without consultation with the other marker. However, markers are at liberty to discuss their assessments after recording their Independent Mark. Where an agreed compromise is readily obtained an Agreed Mark can be recorded.
MInf PROJECT ASSESSMENT

If you know of mitigating factors which should be taken into account, please do not compensate for them in your assessment, but mention them in the appropriate section of the marking report and indicate the degree of compensation you feel would be appropriate. If you feel that the dissertation does not do justice to the student’s work, make this clear in your report, together with an explanation. Supervisors should note the extent to which the student was self-directed, or required close supervision.

Differences from UG4 projects: MInf projects are carried out in two parts, the first one being during the fourth year with the second during the fifth. The first half consists of a project that is essentially self-contained but it should be planned in such a way as to allow for expansion and greater depth for the following year. Note that as this is the first half of an 80 point project it is recognised that a longer planning phase might be involved as compared to a standard UG4 project. In any case, the report should include a clear account of this aspect along with a justification.

The second half continues from MInf Project (Part 1) starting with work identified in the report for MInf Project (Part 1). It is expected that work here will go into greater depth, the work carried out is not necessarily limited to that which was identified in MInf Project (Part 1). The report for the second part must have an introduction and synopsis, in which the project topic is described and the achievements of MInf Project (Part 1) are briefly summarised (no more than 10 pages). Markers for the second part are not expected to read the report for the first one.

Note: In order to enter fifth year, students are required to pass MInf Project (Part 1). In fifth year it is possible to graduate without passing MInf Project (Part 2).

The remainder of this section gives advice on assessing the varying styles of project arising within the School of Informatics. Before discussing marking, we identify the “phases” of an MInf project.

1. Research and Background. This is where the student provides context for the project. They will identify and absorb related and parallel work, identify the key ideas they will build on in the project, and identify any new skills and techniques they will need. They will also identify the criteria they will use in the evaluation of the project.

2. Planning and Design. In the planning phase, the student should identify what needs to be done and what will be produced, and give a feasible strategy for carrying out the project. Any software to be produced as part of the project needs to be designed according to some methodology, and thought should be given to testing and evaluation.
3. Realisation and Implementation. The project plan must be realised: the design must be implemented and tested, and the experiments must be performed.

4. Evaluation. Evaluation needs to cover what was produced: for example, how well does the software perform?; with hindsight were the design choices made the right ones?; how does the project compare with other related work? Where there are users, the student should evaluate how the users react to the software. Other considerations are the extent to which the objectives of the project were met, and the scope for further development.

In marking projects, please use the following guidelines:

- Every project should include a substantial amount of work on phases 2, 3, 4 (taken jointly).
- For projects where system-building / development is the main goal of the project, you may give extra weight to phases 2 and 3 of the project, and less weight to phase 1.
- For projects which are data-driven, and experimentation is very important, you may give less weight to phase 2 and 3 of the project, and emphasise phases 1 and 4.
- For projects which require that the student understand (and apply) ideas which are technically difficult, you may give extra weight to phase 1 (as long as this difficult material is presented well in the report), while giving less weight to phases 3 and 4.
- ‘Completion’ of a project covers achievement of the original objectives, achievement of modified objectives, or providing convincing evidence that the objectives are unachievable. In the case of MInf (Part 1) projects it is acceptable for certain aspects to be deferred to the MInf (Part 2) project provided they are explicitly justified and sufficient self-contained work has been carried out for MInf (Part 1).

The comments above are not (intended to be) disjoint, nor do they cover every eventuality. Do also bear in mind that for MInf projects some aspects might be given more weight during one of the two years. For example some experiments might not be carried out during fourth year because preference was given to developing the system. Such choices should be justified in the report.

We finish by giving guidance for three of the most common “styles” of Informatics project:

**Type A:** These are fairly large development projects, where the task is fairly well-defined, and the solution is fairly clear. The challenge is to use standard Software Engineering / Programming / Hardware techniques to engineer the system. The amount of coding for these projects is often fairly substantial
Marking for **A**: Less weight to phase 1, extra weight to phases 2 and 3 (these should be substantial)

**Type B**: Some projects deal with problems whose solution is either unknown or unclear at the beginning, or alternatively is known but involves fairly complicated techniques. Type B projects involve more problem-solving than Type A projects, but may involve less coding. Type B projects are usually a mixture of theory and practice, and often in the domain of Computer Science.

**Marking for B**: Extra weight for phase 1, slightly less weight to phases 2 and 3.

**Type C**: Some projects are experimental or data-driven, involving the exploitation of techniques from AI (e.g. neural networks, SVM, etc.) or from CS (e.g. clustering methods). The common theme with Type C projects is that the techniques to be evaluated are often known from the beginning and/or are a simple modification of known techniques. Often the techniques themselves are complex. The challenge is to perform very thorough experimental evaluations of these systems.

**Marking for C**: Extra weight to phases 1 and 4, less weight to phases 2 and 3.
MInf Project (Part 1) Examination Report.

Please complete this form and give a mark independently of the other marker.

The information on this form is held by the ITO and is used in determining the student’s eventual course mark. That mark is made available to them on the MyEd portal shortly after it has been ratified by the Board of Examiners. The content of the form itself is not automatically sent to students.

Please read the following notes:

- Notes for Guidance
- Project Assessment

Project Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marker

| Supervisor       |   |
| Name of Marker   |   |

Basic Criteria

Please select the appropriate box for each of the following criteria:
(0: not applicable, 1: inadequate, 2: adequate, 3: average, 4: good, 5: excellent)

A. Understanding of the problem  ○ 0  ○ 1  ○ 2  ○ 3  ○ 4  ○ 5

B. Quality of work done for Part 1  ○ 0  ○ 1  ○ 2  ○ 3  ○ 4  ○ 5

C. Preparation for Part 2  ○ 0  ○ 1  ○ 2  ○ 3  ○ 4  ○ 5

D. Completeness of the project  ○ 0  ○ 1  ○ 2  ○ 3  ○ 4  ○ 5

E. Quality of the dissertation  ○ 0  ○ 1  ○ 2  ○ 3  ○ 4  ○ 5
Additional criteria

F. Knowledge of the literature ⊙ 0 ⊙ 1 ⊙ 2 ⊙ 3 ⊙ 4 ⊙ 5
G. Critical evaluation of previous work ⊙ 0 ⊙ 1 ⊙ 2 ⊙ 3 ⊙ 4 ⊙ 5
H. Critical evaluation of own work ⊙ 0 ⊙ 1 ⊙ 2 ⊙ 3 ⊙ 4 ⊙ 5
I. Justification of the design decisions ⊙ 0 ⊙ 1 ⊙ 2 ⊙ 3 ⊙ 4 ⊙ 5
J. Solution of any conceptual problems (for Part 1) ⊙ 0 ⊙ 1 ⊙ 2 ⊙ 3 ⊙ 4 ⊙ 5
K. Amount of work ⊙ 0 ⊙ 1 ⊙ 2 ⊙ 3 ⊙ 4 ⊙ 5

Exceptional criteria

L. Evidence of originality ⊙ 0 ⊙ 1 ⊙ 2 ⊙ 3 ⊙ 4 ⊙ 5
M. Outstanding scholarship and/or publishable research

Special recognition (not forming part of the formal assessment)

N. The project is particularly suitable for demonstration (e.g. at Open Days) ⊙ 0 ⊙ 1 ⊙ 2 ⊙ 3 ⊙ 4 ⊙ 5
O. The project should be considered for an Informatics prize ⊙ 0 ⊙ 1 ⊙ 2 ⊙ 3 ⊙ 4 ⊙ 5
P. The project should be considered for an external prize ⊙ 0 ⊙ 1 ⊙ 2 ⊙ 3 ⊙ 4 ⊙ 5

Comments on the Criteria
Justify your ratings on the criteria here. Include comments on research and background, planning and design, realisation and implementation, and evaluation. Please mention positive as well as negative aspects.
MInf Project (Part 1) Mark

Mark to be awarded (%)  

Range of marks computed from criteria (%)  

Comments on the Mark
Comment here on your numerical mark. A mark which falls outside of the range corresponding to your ratings on the criteria must be explicitly justified.


Comments from supervisor only
Mitigating factors


Extent of student’s self-direction


MInf Project (Part 2) Examination Report.

Please complete this form and give a mark independently of the other marker.

The information on this form is held by the ITO and is used in determining the student’s eventual course mark. That mark is made available to them on the MyEd portal shortly after it has been ratified by the Board of Examiners. The content of the form itself is not automatically sent to students.

Please read the following notes:

- Notes for Guidance
- Project Assessment

Project Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Marker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic Criteria

Please select the appropriate box for each of the following criteria:
(0: not applicable, 1: inadequate, 2: adequate, 3: average, 4: good, 5: excellent)

A. Summary of Part 1  0  1  2  3  4  5
B. Understanding of the problem  0  1  2  3  4  5
C. Completeness of the project (Parts 1 & 2)  0  1  2  3  4  5
D. Quality of the work done for Part 2  0  1  2  3  4  5
E. Quality of the dissertation  0  1  2  3  4  5
Additional criteria

F. Knowledge of the literature ⊗ 0 ⊗ 1 ⊗ 2 ⊗ 3 ⊗ 4 ⊗ 5
G. Critical evaluation of previous work ⊗ 0 ⊗ 1 ⊗ 2 ⊗ 3 ⊗ 4 ⊗ 5
H. Critical evaluation of own work ⊗ 0 ⊗ 1 ⊗ 2 ⊗ 3 ⊗ 4 ⊗ 5
I. Justification of the design decisions ⊗ 0 ⊗ 1 ⊗ 2 ⊗ 3 ⊗ 4 ⊗ 5
J. Solution of any conceptual problems (for Part 2) ⊗ 0 ⊗ 1 ⊗ 2 ⊗ 3 ⊗ 4 ⊗ 5
K. Amount of work ⊗ 0 ⊗ 1 ⊗ 2 ⊗ 3 ⊗ 4 ⊗ 5

Exceptional criteria

L. Evidence of originality ⊗ 0 ⊗ 1 ⊗ 2 ⊗ 3 ⊗ 4 ⊗ 5
M. Outstanding scholarship and/or ⊗ 0 ⊗ 1 ⊗ 2 ⊗ 3 ⊗ 4 ⊗ 5
publishable research

Special recognition (not forming part of the formal assessment)

N. The project is particularly suitable ⊗ 0 ⊗ 1 ⊗ 2 ⊗ 3 ⊗ 4 ⊗ 5
for demonstration (e.g. at Open Days)
O. The project should be considered for ⊗ 0 ⊗ 1 ⊗ 2 ⊗ 3 ⊗ 4 ⊗ 5
an Informatics prize
P. The project should be considered for ⊗ 0 ⊗ 1 ⊗ 2 ⊗ 3 ⊗ 4 ⊗ 5
an external prize

Comments on the Criteria
Justify your ratings on the criteria here. Include comments on research and background, planning and design, realisation and implementation, and evaluation. Please mention positive as well as negative aspects.
MInf Project (Part 2) Mark

Mark to be awarded (%)   Range of marks computed from criteria (%)

Comments on the Mark
Comment here on your numerical mark. A mark which falls outside of the range corresponding to your ratings on the criteria must be explicitly justified.

Comments from supervisor only

Mitigating factors

Extent of student’s self-direction