COM814 Project – Final Marking Sheet 2015-16

Student: Evan Blair

Date: 28 Sept 2016

Examiner: Adrian Moore

~~Supervisor~~ / 2nd Marker (delete)

Areas	Criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Borderline	Fail	N/A	Commentary
Software development skills (50%) **34**	**From Dissertation**							An interesting idea to take a sub-set of the real London Underground network – giving a realistic data set, while proving the concept behind the algorithm. Good summary of shortest path algorithms with reasoned justification for the selection of that implemented.
	• problem definition / requirements specification		✓					
	• systematic approach to development		✓					
	• testing process documented		✓					
	From Demonstration							
	• robustness of software		✓					
	• range of functionality		✓					
	• data validation	✓						
	• usability of HCI		✓					
	• consistency with stated functionality of software	✓						
	• understanding of software features							
	From Viva							
	• understanding of software technology used		✓					
	• understanding of software features implemented		✓					
Communication skills (20%) **13**	**From Dissertation**							Dissertation is well-written and presented Good description of Dijkstra's algorithm, but the worked example would benefit from a *slightly* more complex graph. Read slides from PC screen with limited eye contact
	• documentation structure and completeness		✓					
	• readability	✓						
	From Demonstration							
	• organized and structured		✓					
	• response to questions		✓					
	From Viva							
	• composure & coherence			✓				
	• response to questions		✓					
Critical and evaluative skills (20%) **13**	**From Dissertation**							Good awareness of limitations such as hard-coding of graph data
	• justification for decisions made throughout project		✓					
	• awareness of related work & technologies		✓					
	• thoroughness of evaluation process		✓					
	From Viva							
	• ability to discuss limitations of work		✓					
	• discuss potential improvements		✓					

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

Total (100%)	Agreed Total	Scaled (70%)	Earlier Components (30%)	Overall Mark
67	70	49	16.25	65

Overall Comments

An interesting project that provided a good challenge for a student at this level.

It is unclear how interchange stations were handled internally by the data structure and the algorithm. Were 'pseudo-stations' used so that there is effectively a different graph node for every instance of a station on a line? 9Are these the 'interchange' edges referred to on page 41?)

An option to specify a 'via' way-point would have been a useful addition.

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.