COM814 Project – Final Marking Sheet 2015-16

Student: Edward Mullan **Date:** 14/09/2016

Examiner: Giuseppe Trombino ~~Supervisor~~ / 2nd Marker (delete)

Areas	Criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Borderline	Fail	N/A	Commentary
Software development skills (50%) **34**	**From Dissertation**							Edward has shown himself a capable developer, and has managed to achieve most of the objectives he set himself for this project. However, the report lacks in the formality that is expected for this type of work. There is excessive detail in some areas of the dissertation where a more succinct approach was needed, while other areas lack in detail that was needed. Some design considerations are not well thought out with a view to make them future-proof, or are poorly justified. However, the software produced is sufficiently robust for this iteration.
	• 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%) **11**	**From Dissertation**							The report is well structured and readable. Some aspects could have been expanded upon and others needed to be summarised. Edward response to questions was eloquent and coherent.
	• 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%) **11**	**From Dissertation**							Decisions made through the project could have been better justified and at times some more thought could have avoided some of the issues encountered. However Edward is well aware of the limitations of the work and the potential improvements that can be made to it.
	• 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 supplied by Supervisor
	• met regularly with supervisor							
	• responded to suggestions							
	• kept satisfactory project log							

Total (100%)	Agreed Total	Scaled (70%)	Earlier Components (30%)	Overall Mark
65	70	49	24	73

Overall Comments

The project has been well developed, although the management aspects may need some polishing. However, the resulting product is of very good quality and the learning demonstrated by the student through the life of the project is well commented in the report. Edward managed to leave a very positive impression in the assessing panel during his viva and demonstration.

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.