

## COM814 Project – Final Marking Sheet 2015-16

Student:

Gareth Leetch

Date:

13/09/16

Examiner:

G Lightbody

Supervisor

Areas	Criteria	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Borderline	Fail	N/A	Commentary
<b>34</b>	<b>From Dissertation</b>							The problem has been well defined and introduced with some interesting commentary on the novice guitar learner. A good review has been done on existing applications and this has informed the requirements. Gareth has discussed potential risks and given a brief overview of the development process followed. An evaluation has occurred but I would encourage a section on testing relating back to the requirements.
	• problem definition / requirements specification		Y					
	• systematic approach to development		Y					
	• testing process documented				Y			
	<b>From Demonstration</b>							
	• robustness of software	Y						
	• range of functionality		Y					
	• data validation			Y				
	• usability of HCI	Y						
	• consistency with stated functionality of software		Y					
	• understanding of software features		Y					
	<b>From Viva</b>							
• understanding of software technology used			Y					
• understanding of software features implemented			Y					
<b>13</b>	<b>From Dissertation</b>							The demo went well – the app worked smoothly.
	• documentation structure and completeness		Y					
	• readability		Y					
	<b>From Demonstration</b>							
	• organized and structured		Y					
	• response to questions							
	<b>From Viva</b>							
• composure & coherence			Y					
• response to questions								
<b>13</b>	<b>From Dissertation</b>							He was able to reflect on the challenges and how he could develop and improve the app.
	• justification for decisions made throughout project		Y					
	• awareness of related work & technologies		Y					
	• thoroughness of evaluation process				Y			
	<b>From Viva</b>							
	• ability to discuss limitations of work			Y				
• discuss potential improvements			Y					

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: 10px auto; text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">7</div>	<b>From Supervisor</b>							
	• took initiative as appropriate		Y					
	• met regularly with supervisor		Y					
	• responded to suggestions		Y					
	• kept satisfactory project log		Y					
<b>Total (100%)</b> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 10px auto; text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">67</div>	<b>Agreed Total</b> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 10px auto; text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">68</div>	<b>Scaled (70%)</b> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 10px auto; text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">47.6</div>		<b>Earlier Components (30%)</b> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 10px auto; text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">18.2</div>			<b>Overall Mark</b> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 10px auto; text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">65.8</div>	
<p><b>Overall Comments</b>  Some interesting commentary on the expectations of the novice learner. A good selection of references used to substantiate these discussions. Figure 23 is very clear and informative.  Looking at the schematics for the lessons (page 20) – has there been any consideration on making the app scalable to include further content/lessons? This is something highlighted in the user feedback.</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.