

COM814 Project – Final Marking Sheet 2015-16

Student:

Marc McNally

Date:

14 Oct 2016

Examiner:

Patrick H Corr

Supervisor

Areas	Criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Borderline	Fail	N/A	Commentary
31	From Dissertation							<p>The software artefact delivered is robust, and reasonably well presented, but the functionality provided and the architectural design used (calculations performed in the app rather than on a server) mean that match predictions cannot be update without reinstalling the app. This severely compromises the usefulness and functionality of the system.</p> <p>The software development process is quite well reported, although requirements are not fully formalised. Testing, particularly acceptance testing is well covered, but a meaningful analysis and evaluation of the accuracy of the predictions, especially against other systems, is lacking</p> <p>A good understanding of the technologies used and of the algorithms and features implemented was demonstrated..</p>
	• 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		✓						
15	From Dissertation							<p>The dissertation is well structured and presented and quite well written, albeit with an overemphasis on tutorial type technical information and evidence that some sections may have been rushed. Detailed requirements (Volere) are omitted - although they were included in an earlier report – and are not discussed in sufficient detail.</p> <p>The presentation and demonstration were well structured, coherent and pitched at the correct level. Indeed, the presentation, although quite long, was one of the best I've seen.</p> <p>Questions were answered competently throughout.</p>
	• documentation structure and completeness		✓					
	• readability		✓					
	From Demonstration							
	• organized and structured		✓					
	• response to questions	✓						
	From Viva							
• composure & coherence		✓						
• response to questions	✓							
14	From Dissertation							<p>Both the dissertation and viva demonstrated good critical awareness and evaluation of both the process followed and the artefact produced. Active decisions were taken throughout, though often for reasons of expediency rather than for the good of the project. The evaluation of the success of the project is overly critical and lacking in depth and rigour. Marc is well aware of the limitations of the system and how it could be improved and, at the viva, gave a refreshingly open, thorough and honest critical review of the project's successes and shortcomings.</p>
	• 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%) <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">8</div>	From Supervisor							
	• took initiative as appropriate	✓						Marc took ownership of the project at an early stage and worked independently throughout. He engaged well and sought regular feedback, however, he did not always follow advice given, often to the detriment of the project.
	• met regularly with supervisor	✓						
	• responded to suggestions		✓					
	• kept satisfactory project log			✓				
Total (100%)	Agreed Total	Scaled (70%)		Earlier Components (30%)			Overall Mark	
<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">68</div>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">68</div>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">47.6</div>		<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">19.5</div>			<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">67</div>	
Overall Comments Whilst the software produced is somewhat limited in its functionality and usefulness, Marc has clearly learned a lot over the course of the project, mastering a range of new skills and developing a strong understanding and appreciation of the software development process..								

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.