

Student Name	Alexander Davis
Student Number	S14110259
Course and Year	
Module Code	CMP6012
Module Title	Individual Project
Module Leader	Fiaz Afsar
Assessment item:	Project Proposal – Deliverable 1

Marker Name:	Yevgeniya Kovalchuk	Date:	12/11/2016
---------------------	----------------------------	--------------	-------------------

Feedback: General comments on the quality of the work, its successes and where it could be improved

Your proposal is well-written, with all the required sections completed with relevant information. You have identified and discussed a few issues demonstrating the demand for your product. You have considered alternative solutions to some of the product features and justified the ones you propose to implement. Great use of figures and diagrams to negotiate your ideas. Your Schedule is detailed and well-thought.

To make your proposal stronger, you could have considered and researched the benefits your product could bring to the stakeholders other than students (the University's management, teaching and mentoring staff, Mental Health and Wellbeing student services team members, students' parents and friends, wider community, policy makers, etc.).

Some specific recommendations for improving your work are listed below.

Objectives are usually formulated in a concise way triggering actions required to take. The information you have put in your Objectives section would better suite the Product section, with some issues identified, being put in the Rationale. Your objectives could have been formulated among the following lines:

- achieve a functional design following the Apple iOS Human Interface Guidelines in terms of clarity, deference and depth;
- interface with the university's own file and data entry systems including the Microsoft SharePoint platform;
- implement a feature to allow members of staff to create, amend and cancel appointments for students;
- develop and embed a new version of the referral form.


Your database doesn't feature completed referral forms. Would they be stored in a separate database?

You could have mention other mobile platforms and the reason you opted for the iOS.

Finally, what is the title of your project?

Feed Forward: How to apply the feedback to future submissions

- 1) For your future outputs, use a template with the University's logo on it.
- 2) Consider making your images more readable.
- 3) Give a title for your project.
- 4) Follow the plan and continue working hard to build on the great start!

Provisional uncapped mark: %	80	Enter Marks below first in boxes below then click Provisional Uncapped mark box to automatically calculate final mark ←
<i>Marker to indicate Yes where applicable;</i>		
Work submitted late but within 2 hours of deadline		Mark reduced by 10% of the awarded mark ¹
Work submitted late but within 5 working days of deadline		Mark capped at minimum pass mark ²
Work submitted more than 5 working days after deadline		Mark of zero
Support summary applied to original deadline	Yes	
Support summary adjustments applied to marking		
Proposed mark for submission to exam board³:		%

¹Where the original mark was a pass and a 10% reduction would take it below a pass, the minimum pass mark will be recorded.

²The minimum pass mark for undergraduate programmes is 40% and for postgraduate programmes is 50%.

Quality and use of standard English & academic conventions				Notes
Spelling	Good	Acceptable	Poor	
Grammar	Good	Acceptable	Poor	
Punctuation	Good	Acceptable	Poor	
Academic Style	Good	Acceptable	Poor	
Structure	Good	Acceptable	Poor	
Referencing	Good	Acceptable	Poor	
If any of the above are highlighted as Poor you should arrange a consultation with a member of staff from the Centre for Academic Success via Success@bcu.ac.uk				

3Marks are provisional until confirmed by an examination board and may be altered up or down. Successful claims for extenuating circumstances will result in the marks submitted to the exam board being uncapped. Marks shown in Moodle are always the uncapped mark.

Marks awarded for criteria

Element %	0-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-100	Enter Mark Awarded (%)
Aims, Objectives and methodology (50%)	Very limited or no suitable objectives and little indication of being aware of requirements. No attempt to discuss with supervisor or Project Module Co-ordinator.	Objectives are not satisfactory but additional work should lead to improvements. There has been little or no consideration of methods/approaches, which have significant shortcomings,	Objectives are adequate but there are obvious improvements possible and limitations of methods/approaches have not been noted.	Objectives which reflect the project guidance include both project specific some wider issues, although some have been omitted. There is justification for the methods/approaches selected. Some limitations of the methods/approaches are not noted.	Alternative methods/approaches have been considered and there is justification for those selected. Some limitations of the methods may not be noted. Where there is a shortfall in methodology, there is reasonable justification.	There is a logical set of demanding objectives to include both project specific and wider aspects. Alternative methods/approaches have been considered and there is justification for those selected. There is awareness of limitations of the methods and suggestions to overcome them, but there may be a small number not identified. Where there is a shortfall in methodology, there is reasonable justification.	Alternative methods/approaches have been considered fully and there is justification for those selected. There is a clear awareness of limitations of the methods and suggestions to overcome them. Where there is a shortfall in methodology, there is excellent justification.	75

Initial Academic Research (30%)	Little or no relevant research or demonstration of knowledge of how to undertake research	Very little research but some awareness of what should have been achieved and how to go about it.	Some information gathering has taken place but it is only just adequate and much additional research work should have been achieved at this stage.	There is evidence of initial research covering some categories but further research and information gathering could have been achieved at this stage.	There is evidence of good initial research covering a range of categories (journal, text, web) and topics (aim-specific and wider issue) using appropriate techniques/sources.	There is evidence of very good initial research covering a range of categories (journal, text, web) and topics (aim-specific and wider issue) using appropriate techniques/sources.	There is evidence of excellent initial research covering a broad range of categories (journal, text, web) and topics (aim-specific and wider issue) using appropriate techniques/sources leading towards an extensive information base.	75
--	---	---	--	---	--	---	---	----

Project management and Progress (20%)	<p>Little or no progress. Evidence of activity, in relation to expected progress is poor and not adequately explained. If there has been a meeting with the supervisor, it has not led to subsequent relevant activity.</p>	<p>Little progress towards reasonable objectives. There is a schedule for completing the objectives and although there is no demonstrable progress, there is ability to articulate a coherent plan which could lead to satisfactory progress. Where progress is less than excellent there is full and justified explanation.</p>	<p>Some progress towards reasonable objectives. The full proposal document has been discussed with the supervisor. There is a reasonable schedule. In areas of no progress there is explanation.</p>	<p>Adequate progress towards reasonable objectives. The full proposal document was submitted on time and has been discussed with the supervisor. There is an adequate schedule. Where progress is less than adequate there is justified explanation.</p>	<p>Good progress towards challenging objectives. The full proposal document was submitted on time and has been discussed with the supervisor. There is a good schedule. Where progress is less than good there is justified explanation.</p>	<p>Very good progress towards challenging objectives. The full proposal document was submitted on time and has been discussed with the supervisor. There is a detailed and well planned schedule (Gantt or equivalent). Where progress is less than very good there is full and justified explanation.</p>	<p>Excellent progress towards very challenging objectives. The full proposal document was submitted on time and has been discussed with in detail the supervisor. There is a comprehensive and well planned schedule (Gantt or equivalent). Where progress is less than excellent there is full and justified explanation.</p>	100
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	-----