

COM814 Project – Final Marking Sheet 2015-16

Student:

Michael McMacken

Date:

20/09/19

Examiner:

Dr Sandra Moffett

Supervisor

Areas	Criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Borderline	Fail	N/A	Commentary	
28	From Dissertation								
	• 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								
13	From Dissertation								
	• documentation structure and completeness		X					Confident presentation, good use of recent SA example.	
	• readability		X						
	From Demonstration								
	• organized and structured		X						
	• response to questions		X						
	From Viva								
	• composure & coherence			X					
• response to questions		X							
15	From Dissertation								
	• justification for decisions made throughout project		X					Evaluation linked to the results of the SA findings.	
	• 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%) <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">7</div>	From Supervisor							
	• took initiative as appropriate		X					
	• met regularly with supervisor		X					
	• responded to suggestions		X					
	• kept satisfactory project log		X					
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;">63</div>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">63</div>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">44.1</div>		<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">18.9</div>			<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">63</div>	
Overall Comments								
<p>Detailed report which describes all aspects of the process in a very comprehensive manner. The literature section is concise, adequately setting the research setting in context, good use of appropriate academic sources. Snippets of code included to support key development features. Evidence of testing included, user engagement not relevant for this type of project.</p> <p>Presentation was very detailed but took longer than time allocated, the student was allowed to deliver the presentation but it diluted the impact.</p>								

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.