

Student Name	Alexander Davis		
Student Number	14110259		
Course and Year	3		
Module Code	CMP6102		
Module Title	Individual Project		
Module Leader	Fiaz Afsar		
Assessment item:	Final Report – Deliverable 4		
Marker Name:	Dr. Yevgeniya Kovalchuk	Date:	31/05/2017
Second Marker:	Dr. Daniel C. Doolan	Date:	31/05/2017

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

All expected front matter present and well formed. Report Core P1-25. Introduction P1 – could provide more context background. Objectives – could have enunciated the key objectives, rather than beginning with a quote from apple. Objective are not clearly identified – P2 – seems to be more of a discussion – perhaps more suited to background research ! P3 – some of this content may be more suited for the Further Work section of the Conclusion chapter. P4 chapter list present. Perhaps some further consideration to this chapter could be given as to the most appropriate place for much of its content. Lit review present. Background Research P11-13. Good to get some first hand primary research by conducting interview – perhaps some discussion / analysis would be useful to see. Good to see mention of current system P12, perhaps some further concrete detail on its operation would benefit. Could have also explored issues of HCI, mobile interaction, accessibility, libraries, sdks, design guidelines, color models/meaning and so forth. Discussion of requirement present. Design – P16-17 – very limited discussion – how / why were the designs envisaged. Good to see flowcharts, what about hand drawn sketches, UML, discussion of data storage ERD, normalisation and so forth. Implementation P18-19 – little more than a page – no real interplay of screenshots coupled with code listing to detail the work undertaking / how / why / problems encountered / solutions found / reasoning of decisions. Good selection of functional testing evidence. Some comments provided on user evaluations P22. Evaluation / conclusions generally logical and insightful / well grounded.

Feed Forward: How to apply the feedback to future submissions

See comments above. Formal reports should really try and avoid the first person narrative.

Provisional uncapped mark: %	60	
Marker to indicate Yes where applicable;	→	
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		
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%.

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.

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				

Marks awarded for criteria

Element	0-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-100	Awarded Mark
Achievement of objectives (40%)	Substantial deficiencies through one or a combination of incompleteness, superficiality or incoherence. Major additional work and re-drafting of the report required	Serious shortfall in achievement of objectives. Treatment of results is too superficial and/or incomplete. However, there is evidence to suggest that some further work and re-drafting could bring performance to a pass standard.	There is an adequate quantity of appropriate level work involving application of course-relevant knowledge and leading to limited achievement of undemanding objectives. Background research has enabled only cursory consideration of wider issues. However there is evidence of ability to undertake investigation, obtain reasonable results, manipulate relevant data and generate reasonable content. However, there may be significant shortcomings - errors/omissions - in the various aspects of the work.	Evidence of generally competent work leading to achievement of appropriate, but not fully challenging, objectives; or some incompleteness of challenging objectives. Background research has enabled some reasonable consideration of wider issues.	Evidence of good quality work, involving in-depth theory/concepts, leading to the achievement of demanding objectives, although some areas could have been covered more thoroughly and/or with greater depth and insight. The content demonstrates depth of knowledge in the subject area relevant to the project aims and has benefited from relevant research.	Evidence of much high quality work, involving advanced theory/concepts relevant to the course, and leading to the achievement of demanding objectives using appropriate methods. The content demonstrates depth of knowledge in the subject area relevant to the project aims and has benefited from the outcomes of extensive research.	Objectives achieved to the highest standard.	55
Use of academic Literature	Little or no relevant research or demonstration	Little research but enough to indicate ability	Some relevant research, but with shortcomings in	A broad research identifying much information. Ho	Wide ranging research using most	Wide ranging research using all appropriate	Literature presented throughout	55

<p>(20%)</p>	<p>of ability to undertake research. Little or no evidence of analysis or indication of potential in this area.</p>	<p>to pass if further work undertaken. So me, but insufficient, evaluation, but with evidence of ability to analyse which could lead to a pass standard with further work.</p>	<p>extent and level. Some appraisal of relevance, but significant shortcomings in extent or validity of analysis.</p> <p>All documentary sources (texts, journal articles, etc.) are listed under the reference heading and appropriately cited in the report</p>	<p>ever some may not be directly relevant and more advanced work may be overlooked. Ther e may not be a demonstration of knowledge and understanding associated with higher grades. Generally competent consideration of findings. All documentary sources (texts, journal articles, etc.) are listed under the reference heading and appropriately cited in the report</p>	<p>techniques/sources to achieve a good information base. Comprehensive consideration and analysis of findings. Rea soned recommendations cover most relevant areas, although these could have been covered with greater depth and/or insight.</p> <p>All documentary sources (texts, journal articles, etc.) are listed under the reference heading and appropriately cited in the report.</p>	<p>techniques/sources and achieving an extensive information base. Critical analysis of findings with comprehensive consideration of relevance.</p> <p>Effective development of knowledge base following initial literature search. All documentary sources (texts, journal articles, etc.) are listed under the reference heading and appropriately cited in the report.</p>	<p>the project in a comparative and thematic manner of the highest standard</p>	
--------------	---	--	---	---	---	---	---	--

Methodology (10%)	Inappropriate methods described. Little or no consideration of alternative approaches.	There is an insufficient description and consideration of alternative approaches. Methods have been selected without justification.	There is an adequate consideration of methodology leading to reasonable choice of approach, adequately described.	Alternative approaches have been considered and some reasoning supports selection. Those selected as most suitable are justified. Limitations of the methods have been identified.	Alternative approaches have been considered and those appropriate selected with some justification. Limitations of the methods have been identified and ways to overcome them suggested	Alternative approaches have been identified and analysed in depth and those most appropriate selected with full justification and clearly described. Limitations of the methods have been identified and ways to overcome them suggested.	Consideration and application of methodology of the highest standard	65
Analysis and discussion (20%)	Little or no evidence of interpretation /analysis of results/findings and little or no indication of potential in this area.	Some, but insufficient, evaluation, but with enough evidence of ability to analyse, which could lead to a pass standard with further work.	There is evidence of ability to undertake basic treatment of information/results and to explain straightforward findings. There may be some flawed analysis and/or omission of some areas of analysis. Satisfactory conclusions may cover only some of the objectives and some conclusions may not be logically justified.	There is interpretation of straightforward data/findings. Analysis is limited in extent and depth and may have some errors/shortcomings. There is some consideration of wider issues. Selections, conclusions and recommendations are well	Methodical care and competence in the analysis of findings, but without the depth and/or consideration of wider issues. Selections, conclusions and recommendations are well	Interpretation and analysis of findings related to advanced theory/concepts is full and justified. Alternative approaches and wider issues are considered comprehensively. There is reasoned and logical justification for selections,	Analysis, discussion and critique throughout of the highest academic standard.	70

					reasoned and justified.	conclusions and recommendations.		
Report structure (10%)	Report requires major drafting/re-drafting in most or all sections	Serious shortcomings in structure and/or presentation, but enough indication of ability to suggest some additional work should lead to a pass standard. There may be some error or lack of evidence in citing references in the report.	Includes major elements but there may be omissions or shortcomings in logical order, such as inappropriate use of chapters, sections, figures and appendices. The text may have significant shortcomings in style, language and/or lack of conciseness. It may not be straightforward to follow. However, there should be adequate demonstration of ability to present a readable account, supported by some relevant tables/diagrams/visual forms presenting data.	Report generally follows guidelines including all main elements. There may be some shortcomings in clarity of both text and visual presentation and some minor omissions of content.	No significant shortcoming in structure with all the main elements included. Tabulated/diagrammatic/visual presentation of data is clear and the report is well referenced throughout. Style and language generally in accordance with the guidelines although there may be some minor deficiencies.	Report includes all necessary elements and is appropriately referenced throughout. Presentation of result/findings is clear and is supported using suitable visual /diagrammatic /tabular techniques. Succinct text with style and language in accordance with guidelines and with no significant shortcomings. There are appropriate supporting appendices.	A project report presented to the highest standard.	65