COM814 Project – Final Marking Sheet 2015-16

Student: Abiodun Oke   **Date:** 14 Sept 2016

Examiner: Patrick H Corr   **2nd Marker**

Areas	Criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Borderline	Fail	N/A	Commentary
Software development skills (50%) **38**	**From Dissertation**							The software produced is robust and an impressive range of functionality has been implemented to the point where all of the stated requirements have been met. The user interface is very well designed and it is clear that Abiodun has a good understanding of the software developed and the technologies used – albeit that there is significant room for improvement in the code structure and design of the database. The testing process, while not complete, was carried out with an impressive degree of formality. Whilst the report is well structured and background research is good, requirements are not fully developed and documentation of the wider software engineering process is not quite to the same standard.
	• problem definition / requirements specification			X				
	• systematic approach to development		X					
	• testing process documented	X						
	From Demonstration							
	• robustness of software	X						
	• range of functionality	X						
	• data validation		X					
	• usability of HCI	X						
	• consistency with stated functionality of software		X					
	• understanding of software features		X					
	From Viva							
	• understanding of software technology used		X					
	• understanding of software features implemented		X					
Communication skills (20%) **13**	**From Dissertation**							The dissertation is readable, but there are a significant number of minor errors and inconsistencies. Other issues are noted above. Abiodun communicated well in the viva and answered questions confidently and competently. It is clear that he has a good understanding of the system developed, including its limitations, and his knowledge of the programming techniques used, and how they might be improved, is strong.
	• documentation structure and completeness			X				
	• readability		X					
	From Demonstration							
	• organized and structured		X					
	• response to questions		X					
	From Viva							
	• composure & coherence		X					
	• response to questions		X					
Critical and evaluative skills (20%) **14**	**From Dissertation**							The review of existing systems is good, and most decisions taken are justified and critically analysed. The evaluation process was quite good, if a little limited in both scope and depth of analysis. Abiodun is fully aware of the limitations of his implementation and how it might be improved.
	• justification for decisions made throughout project		X					
	• awareness of related work & technologies	X						
	• thoroughness of evaluation process		X					
	From Viva							
	• ability to discuss limitations of work	X						
	• discuss potential improvements		X					

Areas	Criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Borderline	Fail	N/A	Commentary
Professional Engagement (10%) **9**	**From Supervisor**							
	• took initiative as appropriate							Mark allocated by supervisor
	• met regularly with supervisor							
	• responded to suggestions							
	• kept satisfactory project log							

Total (100%)	Agreed Total	Scaled (70%)	Earlier Components (30%)	Overall Mark
74	**76**	**53.2**	**20.1**	**73**

Overall Comments

An excellent piece of work.

Although the structure of the underlying code could be improved, Abiodun has clearly put a lot of effort into the project and produced a good, robust piece of software with an impressive range of functionality. Overall, the documentation is not quite to the same standard, but user interface design and the formality of the testing process are particularly good. Over the course of the project Abiodun has developed into a confident and competent Software Engineer.

Mark Range Guidance

Excellent: 70 - 100:

Here the candidate must demonstrate clear excellence across all aspects of the background research, project report, software/hardware implementation, oral presentation and project management. There must be evidence of originality and creativity, indicated by novel insight, and clearly supported by a high level of initiative, motivation and independent work. The work must be at a level which suggests that the student has the ability to pursue doctoral research. The student must impress the examiners with the elegance of his/her conception of the solution to the problem.

Good: 60 - 69:

To achieve this level there must be significant evidence of wide and deep study in relevant material and texts. This must be placed in its wider academic and research context. There must be an imaginative approach, a balanced treatment of possibilities and comprehensive thinking. The expression of a solution must exhibit an understanding of its relation to the total process. All or most of the project report, software/hardware implementation, oral presentation and project management are considered at least adequate with some parts excellent although there will likely be a lack of creativity or innovative flair.

Satisfactory: 50 - 59:

At this level the candidate has performed a study of the given project but there is not much evidence of in-depth work. All or most of the project report, software/hardware implementation, oral presentation and project management are considered adequate although some or all are not covered in depth. Requirements analysis might include user requirements but lack non-functional requirements. Testing and evaluation might have been conducted, but not as part of an overall test strategy which incorporates formal recording of results. The software/hardware implementation may be available but with a number of flaws and deficiencies and possibly an inadequate coverage of the original specification.

Borderline: 45 - 49:

At this level there has been a reasonable attempt to complete the project overall but either the software/hardware produced and/or the dissertation have fallen below minimum standards. The work is considered redeemable with reasonable effort.

Fail: 0 - 44:

Here the student has failed to achieve a satisfactory level of performance in one or more areas to a level where the work is considered irredeemable. The project area is insufficiently understood, the results untenable, or the written and/or oral presentation of the work is significantly flawed. There may be no software or hardware demonstration. There may have been a complete lack of background research, leading to a serious lack of understanding of the requirements or methodology appropriate to the topic under consideration. All or most of the project report, software/hardware demonstration and oral presentation and project management are inadequate. The supervisor might have found the candidate not attending regular meetings or only providing work towards the end of the project rather than consistently throughout the period.