COM814 Project – Final Marking Sheet 2015-16

Student: Conor Mackel   **Date:** 13/09/16

Examiner: G Lightbody   **Supervisor**

Areas	Criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Borderline	Fail	N/A	Commentary
Software development skills (50%) **31**	**From Dissertation**							The student has performed a reasonable level of investigation which has led to the development of his user stories but more formal requirements documentation, project management, and software development processes needed.
	• problem definition / requirements specification		Y					
	• systematic approach to development		Y					
	• testing process documented			Y				
	From Demonstration							
	• robustness of software		Y					
	• range of functionality		Y					
	• data validation			Y				
	• usability of HCI			Y				
	• consistency with stated functionality of software		Y					
	• understanding of software features		Y					
	From Viva							
	• understanding of software technology used		Y					
	• understanding of software features implemented		Y					
Communication skills (20%) **12**	**From Dissertation**							The report was well written and very readable. Figures, tables and images used effectively. Excellent referencing.
	• documentation structure and completeness		Y					
	• readability	Y						The student is organised and the presentation went well. He was clear and the level of content was appropriate.
	From Demonstration							
	• organized and structured		Y					
	• response to questions		Y					
	From Viva							
	• composure & coherence		Y					
	• response to questions		Y					
Critical and evaluative skills (20%) **12**	**From Dissertation**							The student is able to discuss the limitations and possible expansion of the project.
	• justification for decisions made throughout project		Y					
	• awareness of related work & technologies	Y						
	• thoroughness of evaluation process		Y					
	From Viva							
	• ability to discuss limitations of work		Y					
	• discuss potential improvements		Y					

Areas	Criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Borderline	Fail	N/A	Commentary
Professional Engagement (10%) 7	**From Supervisor**							
	• took initiative as appropriate		Y					
	• met regularly with supervisor		Y					
	• responded to suggestions	Y						
	• kept satisfactory project log		Y					

Total (100%)	Agreed Total	Scaled (70%)	Earlier Components (30%)	Overall Mark
61	59	41.3	18.2	59.5

Overall Comments

An interesting chapter 2 with some useful details and references. You have provided a good review of existing web sites and solutions. Chapter 4 provides a good overview of the development. Note that colour schemes / font etc are important in terms of accessibility. A review of the data sets to be included would have added to the report and the choices made.
Overall a very well written report with a reasonable depth and breadth of the investigations and development done. A key aspect missing from the project has been the software development processes and project management, mitigating risks etc. There should be a more formal management of functional and non-functional requirements etc. However, the website looks fine and returns celestial events. It also has a level of responsiveness to the layout. Note that the forum adds the new addition to the bottom – this would be better added to the top so that older posts are further down the page.

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.