COM814 Project – Final Marking Sheet

Student: Emma Lynch

Date: 18-10-16

Examiner: Daniel Kelly

(1st Marker)

Areas	Criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Borderline	Fail	N/A	Commentary
Software development skills (50%) 25	**From Dissertation**							This is a resit of a previous submission. The main issue with previous submission was lack of demonstrable software. The student has now addressed this issue and showed a working app. The app is limited in its functionality, however there is enough working pieces in my opinion. Dissertation is satisfactory. Some limitations in discussions relating to testing.
	• 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%) 10	**From Dissertation**							Information was described in satisfactory level in dissertation. Student spoke well in the viva and explained different aspects of problem and solution.
	• 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%) 10	**From Dissertation**							Student was able to discuss weaknesses and possible solutions.
	• 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			

Areas	Criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Borderline	Fail	N/A	Commentary
	• ability to suggest how work could be improved			x				
Professional Engagement (10%)	**From Supervisor**							
	• took initiative as appropriate			x				Overall communication with supervisor was limited.
5	• met regularly with supervisor				x			
	• responded to suggestions			x				
	• kept satisfactory project log				x			

Total (100%)	Agreed Total	Scaled (90%)	Analysis & Design Report (10%)	Overall Mark
50	50	45	5	50

Overall Comments

Overall, the student has met the criteria set out after the last submission. That is, she has produced a working piece of software.

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