

## COM814 Project – Final Marking Sheet 2015-16

Student:

David Gleghorne

Date:

8 Sept 2016

Examiner:

Patrick H Corr

Supervisor

Areas	Criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Borderline	Fail	N/A	Commentary	
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 40px; margin: auto;">41</div>	<b>Software development skills (50%)</b>	<b>From Dissertation</b>							<p>This is an excellent project. David has proven himself to be a highly competent software developer, submitting a complete and robust system, engineered to a high professional standard.</p> <p>Choice and application of the development methodology were good and design of the underlying database was particularly strong, proving capable of supporting further development of the functionality.</p>
	• problem definition / requirements specification	X							
	• systematic approach to development	X							
	• testing process documented	X							
	<b>From Demonstration</b>								
	• 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							
<b>From Viva</b>									
• understanding of software technology used	X								
• understanding of software features implemented	X								
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 40px; margin: auto;">15</div>	<b>Communication skills (20%)</b>	<b>From Dissertation</b>							<p>The report is complete, readable and well structured, but there are a number of typographical and grammatical mistakes throughout. The demonstration was well organised, clear and comprehensive and delivered in a confident and professional manner.</p> <p>Throughout both the demonstration and viva, David's understanding and mastery of all aspects of the project, including the wider context and the technologies used, were clearly evident.</p>
	• documentation structure and completeness	X							
	• readability		X						
	<b>From Demonstration</b>								
	• organized and structured	X							
	• response to questions	X							
	<b>From Viva</b>								
	• composure & coherence	X							
• response to questions	X								
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 40px; margin: auto;">15</div>	<b>Critical and evaluative skills (20%)</b>	<b>From Dissertation</b>							<p>Practically all decisions taken are justified and critically analysed. Review of the market, discussion of the design philosophy and final evaluation were good, but the justification of the choice of technology could have been stronger.</p> <p>David is well aware of the limitations of the system and how it could be improved.</p>
	• justification for decisions made throughout project	X							
	• awareness of related work & technologies		X						
	• thoroughness of evaluation process		X						
	<b>From Viva</b>								
	• ability to discuss limitations of work	X							
• discuss potential improvements	X								

Areas	Criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Borderline	Fail	N/A	Commentary	
<b>Professional Engagement (10%)</b>  <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">9</div>	<b>From Supervisor</b>								
	• took initiative as appropriate	x						David's approach to professional engagement was faultless, very professional at all times. A pleasure to supervise.	
	• met regularly with supervisor	x							
	• responded to suggestions	x							
	• kept satisfactory project log			x					
<b>Total (100%)</b>  <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">80</div>	<b>Agreed Total</b>  <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">78</div>	<b>Scaled (70%)</b>  <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">54.6</div>		<b>Earlier Components (30%)</b>  <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">24</div>			<b>Overall Mark</b>  <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto; text-align: center; line-height: 40px;">79</div>		
<b>Overall Comments</b>  An excellent piece of work.  David has clearly invested a lot of time and effort in the project, learning and mastering a range of new skills and developing into a competent and confident software developer.									

## 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.