


<b>Student Name</b>	Alexander Davis		
<b>Student Number</b>	14110259		
<b>Course and Year</b>			
<b>Module Code</b>	CMP6102		
<b>Module Title</b>	Individual Project		
<b>Module Leader</b>	Fiaz Afsar		
<b>Assessment item:</b>	A1 Project Presentation /Viva – Deliverable 3		
<b>Supervisor:</b>	Dr Yevgeniya Kovalchuk	<b>Date:</b>	18/05/2017
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Marker</b>	Dr Daniel Doolan	<b>Date:</b>	18/05/2017
<b>Feedback:</b> General comments on the quality of the work, its successes and where it could be improved			
<p>Good presentation and product demonstration; excellent responses during the discussion session demonstrating your understating of the technology and motivation behind your product, as well as where to take it further. To strengthen your poster and presentation, you could have included more technical details around requirement gathering and implementation.</p>			
<b>Feed Forward:</b> How to apply the feedback to future submissions			
<p>Make your exploration of alternative solutions part of your presentations to gain attention and appreciation from the audience. Some may experience similar issues you had and you can help them by pointing towards better choices and guarding against repeating the same mistakes. Audience is also more likely to respect you as a speaker if they see that you have invested a lot of time into development rather than presenting a random or quick fix.</p>			
<b>Provisional uncapped mark: %</b>	<b>77</b> <small>Enter Marks below first in boxes below then click Provisional Uncapped mark box to automatically calculate final mark ←</small>		
<i>Marker to indicate Yes where applicable;</i> 			
<b>Work submitted late but within 2 hours of deadline</b>		Mark reduced by 10% of the awarded mark <sup>1</sup>	
<b>Work submitted late but within 5 working days of deadline</b>		Mark capped at minimum pass mark <sup>2</sup>	
<b>Work submitted more than 5 working days after deadline</b>		Mark of zero	
<b>Support summary applied to original deadline</b>			
<b>Support summary adjustments applied to marking</b>			
<b>Proposed mark for submission to exam board<sup>3</sup>:</b> %			

Quality and use of standard English & academic conventions				Notes
Spelling	Good			
Grammar	Good			
Punctuation	Good			
Academic Style	Good			
Structure	Good			

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

<sup>2</sup>The minimum pass mark for undergraduate programmes is 40% and for postgraduate programmes is 50%.

<sup>3</sup>Marks 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.

Referencing	Good			
If any of the above are highlighted as <b>Poor</b> you should arrange a consultation with a member of staff from the Centre for Academic Success via <a href="mailto:Success@bcu.ac.uk">Success@bcu.ac.uk</a>				

### Marks awarded for criteria

Element	0-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-100	Awarded
<b>A1 Poster (10%)</b>	Poster either incoherent and lacking awareness of basic presentation requirements, or lacking relevant content.	Poster lacks information on key aspects of project, but should be able to attain pass standard with some additional time in preparation	Some deficiencies of key points, lacking clarity, and/or with little impact and some errors. There may be indication of a shortage of planning and care in composing/creating the display. However it adequately presents some of the main points.	Reasonable encapsulation of key points, although the slides may be over-detailed or, in part, lacking a clear message and/or including minor errors.	Good encapsulation of key points, generally clear, with good impact and error free.	Excellent encapsulation of key points, extremely clear, high impact	Excellent slides of the highest standard, error free.	70
<b>Verbal Presentation (30%)</b>	Major shortcomings in clarity and/or relevance.	Presentation lacks clarity and/or relevance. However, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that some additional preparation time would enable a pass standard to be achieved.	Presentation not well planned and delivered, but conveys some relevant information, although with significant deficiencies in content/clarity/interest	Fair description of major features and achievements, some aspects lack of clarity.	Good verbal description of main features of project; straightforward to follow, confident and interesting.	Well planned, coherent oral presentation expressed with confidence and interest, appropriate to the audience, and summarising aims, approach, activity and achievements	An excellent presentation of the highest standard	75
<b>Product demonstration (30%)</b>	Major deficiencies in product through substantial incompleteness or lack of competence in applying appropriate techniques.	Product incomplete, lacking in function or with other serious deficiency in meeting specification that is not satisfactorily explained. However, there is sufficient indication of potential to conclude that some further work could lead to a pass	Demonstrates ability to design/create a product which meets an undemanding specification but there is only limited evidence of originality and with significant shortcomings in function and/or completeness and/or technical aspects.	Generally competent product to a satisfactory technical standard and satisfying an undemanding specification. If applicable, some attention has been given to aesthetic aspects, although there may be some shortcomings in function.	Competently undertaken product with aspects of originality to a good technical standard. If applicable, consideration has been given to aesthetic aspects and the product generally satisfies a demanding functional specification with only some minor	Excellent product demonstrates high level technical competence and originality/creative flare/inventiveness. If applicable, it is aesthetically pleasing and takes account of user/audience requirements and satisfies a demanding functional specification.	An excellent product and demonstration of the highest standard.	69

					deficiencies.			
<b>Interview /Discussion  (30%)</b>	Responses are incoherent or display lack of essential knowledge and/or relevance.	Serious shortfall in ability to explain fundamentals, but should be able to reach pass standard with some additional preparation.	Some hesitance in responses/discussion indicates lack of familiarity with the topic and wider issues, and/or lack of understanding in some areas. However there are adequate responses to questions on key points of knowledge/understanding	Reasonable responses to questions and is able adequately to discuss straightforward aspects. There may be some minor deficiencies in knowledge.	Good responses to questions and in discussion appears to be generally familiar with the specific topic and with relevant wider issues.	Confident, succinct and informative responses to questions. In discussion, appears to be well informed on specific subject knowledge as well as wider issues associated with the project.	Academic answers to the highest standard.	90