**Project Assessment Form After viva**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student Name: |  | Student Id: |  |  | **Overall Final Project Mark** |
| Project Title: |  | | |  |  |
| Supervisor: |  | Moderator: |  |  |

1. **General**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Difficulty:**  How difficult or ambitious was the project. | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 🞏 | Fail (0 – 39) | 🞏 | 2:2 (50 – 59) | |  |  | 🞏 | 2:1 (60 – 69) | | 🞏 | Pass (40 – 49) | 🞏 | 1st - excellent (70-79) | |  |  | 🞏 | 1st - exceptional (80+) | |
| **Comments (if any):** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning and consultation** [Supervisor only]  The work was well planned and carried out methodically throughout the year.  Regular contact maintained and sensible use was made of advice offered.  Did the students keep and submit a FYP journal? | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 🞏 | Fail (0 – 39) | 🞏 | 2:2 (50 – 59) | |  |  | 🞏 | 2:1 (60 – 69) | | 🞏 | Pass (40 – 49) | 🞏 | 1st - excellent (70-79) | |  |  | 🞏 | 1st - exceptional (80+) | |
| **Comments (if any):** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Development of existing skills**  To what extend the student developed known skills and if these were selected and applied correctly in the project domain. | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 🞏 | Fail (0 – 39) | 🞏 | 2:2 (50 – 59) | |  |  | 🞏 | 2:1 (60 – 69) | | 🞏 | Pass (40 – 49) | 🞏 | 1st - excellent (70-79) | |  |  | 🞏 | 1st - exceptional (80+) | |
| **Comments (if any):** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Development of new skills**  To what extend the student acquired new skills and if these were selected and applied correctly in the project domain. | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 🞏 | Fail (0 – 39) | 🞏 | 2:2 (50 – 59) | |  |  | 🞏 | 2:1 (60 – 69) | | 🞏 | Pass (40 – 49) | 🞏 | 1st - excellent (70-79) | |  |  | 🞏 | 1st - exceptional (80+) | |
| **Comments (if any):** | |

**2 Report bought forward**

**Overall Feedback and Grade brought forward from report assessment before viva.**

Please comment on the report, guided by the pre viva Final Year Project Report Rubric.

**Supervisor**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Comment the overall report structure, organisation, writing style, referencing.*  *Comment the report content: introduction, clarity of problem statement and aims and objectives; background; requirements; methodology; conclusions & reflections; ethical consideration.*  *Comment the Product/Implementation/Application/Research description: design; tools and implementation; testing.*  *And any other comments.* | |  |  | | --- | --- | | 🞏 | Fail (0 – 39) | | 🞏 | Pass (40 – 49) | | 🞏 | 2:2 (50 – 59) | | 🞏 | 2:1 (60 – 69) | | 🞏 | 1st - excellent (70-79) | | 🞏 | 1st - exceptional (80+) | |  |  | |

**Moderator**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Comment the overall report structure, organisation, writing style, referencing.*  *Comment the report content: introduction, clarity of problem statement and aims and objectives; background; requirements; methodology; conclusions & reflections; ethical consideration.*  *Comment the Product/Implementation/Application/Research description: design; tools and implementation; testing.*  *And any other comments.* | |  |  | | --- | --- | | 🞏 | Fail (0 – 39) | | 🞏 | Pass (40 – 49) | | 🞏 | 2:2 (50 – 59) | | 🞏 | 2:1 (60 – 69) | | 🞏 | 1st - excellent (70-79) | | 🞏 | 1st - exceptional (80+) | |  |  | |

**3 Viva**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Product/Implementation/Application/Research**  The demonstrated product:   * satisfied the specifications; * run without errors; * had a suitable user interface; * was tested and refined; * was accompanied by any documentation (note: this has not been asked, if it is provided it can be treated as extra). | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 🞏 | Fail (0 – 39) | 🞏 | 2:2 (50 – 59) | |  |  | 🞏 | 2:1 (60 – 69) | | 🞏 | Pass (40 – 49) | 🞏 | 1st - excellent (70-79) | |  |  | 🞏 | 1st - exceptional (80+) | |
| **Comments (if any):** | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Understanding**  The student was able to explain his/her work, part of the code/ research results and defend decisions. | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 🞏 | Fail (0 – 39) | 🞏 | 2:2 (50 – 59) | |  |  | 🞏 | 2:1 (60 – 69) | | 🞏 | Pass (40 – 49) | 🞏 | 1st - excellent (70-79) | |  |  | 🞏 | 1st - exceptional (80+) | |
| **Comments (if any):** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Added Value**  The viva allowed the students to demonstrate a level of understanding that was not evidenced in the report. |  |
| **Comments (if any):** | |

**Overall Comments and Feedback**

Give a brief justification of your overall project final mark considering the entire final year project (report, implementation and viva).

**Supervisor**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Moderator**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Signature of Supervisor: Date:**

**Signature of Moderator: Date:**

**Appendix A Reassessment**

The supervisor should complete this section. Please explain below the work that the student is required to perform in order to achieve a pass. In addition, please indicate if the student should attend for a new viva.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

The following section should be completed for the student’s resubmitted report and/or attendance for a new viva (if it was required).

**Reassessment Result:**

|  |
| --- |
| **OVERALL RESULT FOLLOWING REASSESSMENT AND NEW VIVA:** |

**Signature of Supervisor: Date:**

**Signature of Moderator: Date:**

# Project Assessment Threshold Criteria

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **Indicative meaning** |
| 90-100 | LO1 – LO9. The project is complete, with major critical additions by student. An exemplary piece of work carried out to an extremely high professional standard. Work shows an extremely deep understanding of the problem and evidence of highly creative and original thought is evident throughout. Publishable project.  LO1. Exemplary work is shown in demonstrating the selection, justification and the application of appropriate methods, techniques and tools in tackling problems relating to the project.  LO2. Exemplary work demonstrated in the elicitation of the requirements of the project. Exceptionally clear analysis and specification of the problem being solved demonstrated.  LO3. Exemplary work displayed in project management developing a project plan that scheduled the student’s own activities and time relating to the project activities and timescale.  LO4. Exceptionally coherently presented background research interleaved with student’s own creative commentaries and constructive criticisms of broader issues and related literature to the project. Student is able to present very challenging and complex background material in a precise and logical, yet concise manner.  LO5. Exceptionally well presented design and high-level structure of the software produced. Comprehensive and well-grounded justification of the main design decisions. Exhaustive testing of the software supported with personal comments for the requirements of the specific tests.  LO6. Very high technical difficulty and a very challenging project. Exceptional development of existing skills. Exceptional development of new skills.  LO7. The student has demonstrated an exceptional understanding and wider consideration to legal, social, ethical and professional issues that relate to the project.  LO8. Exceptionally well-written and well-organised professional report. All main themes and issues are clearly identified and presented in a professional way. Exceptionally clear appraisal of the project, including clear well-structured conclusions.  LO9. The student demonstrated a very deep understanding of both the theory and the related practical material in the viva. The software produced is exceptional, with novel and original features. The software is stable and robust and has excellent performance. |
| 80-89 | LO1 – LO9. The project is complete, with major critical additions by student and shows that s/he can work on this subject quite independently in a research environment. An outstanding piece of work carried out to a high professional standard.  LO1. Outstanding work is shown in demonstrating the selection, justification and the application of appropriate methods, techniques and tools in tackling problems relating to the project.  LO2. Outstanding work demonstrated in the elicitation of the requirements of the project. A very clear analysis and specification of the problem being solved demonstrated.  LO3. Outstanding work displayed in project management developing a project plan that scheduled the student’s own activities and time relating to the project activities and timescale.  LO4. Outstanding coherently presented background research. Student is able to demonstrate an outstanding critical analysis of broader issues and related literature to the project.  LO5. Well presented design and high-level structure of the software produced. Comprehensive and well-grounded justification of the main design decisions. Exhaustive testing of the software.  LO6. A technically difficult and a challenging project. Excellent development of existing skills. Excellent development of new skills.  LO7. The student has demonstrated an excellent understanding and wider consideration to legal, social, ethical and professional issues that relate to the project.  LO8. An excellent well-written and well-organised report. All main themes and issues are clearly identified and presented. Exceptionally clear appraisal of the project, including clear well-structured conclusions. |
| 70-79 | LO1 – LO9. The project is complete, with major critical additions by student. An excellent piece of work carried out to a very high standard.  LO1. Excellent work is shown in demonstrating the selection, justification and the application of appropriate methods, techniques and tools in tackling problems relating to the project.  LO2. Excellent work demonstrated in the elicitation of the requirements of the project. A very clear analysis and specification of the problem being solved demonstrated.  LO3. Excellent work displayed in project management developing a project plan that scheduled the student’s own activities and time relating to the project activities and timescale.  LO4. Excellently coherently presented background research. Student is able to demonstrate an outstanding critical analysis broader issues and related literature to the project.  LO5. Clearly presented design and high-level structure of the software produced. Well- grounded justification of the main design decisions. Exhaustive testing of the software. The software has all the required and expected features. The software is stable and robust and has excellent performance.  LO6. High technical difficulty and a challenging project. Significant development of existing skills. Significant development of new skills.  LO7. The student has demonstrated an excellent understanding and wider consideration to legal, social, ethical and professional issues that relate to the project.  LO8. A well-written and well-organised report. Main themes and issues are clearly identified. Very clear appraisal of the project, including clear well- structured conclusions.  LO9. The student is competent in technical matters and understands the theory as demonstrated in the viva. The student is able to solve own problems independently. |
| 60-69 | LO1 – LO9. The project is complete, with some critical additions by student. A very good piece of work carried out to a very good standard.  LO1. Very good work is shown in demonstrating the selection, justification and the application of appropriate methods, techniques and tools in tackling problems relating to the project.  LO2. Very good work demonstrated in the elicitation of the requirements of the project. A good clear analysis and specification of the problem being solved demonstrated. Well-written analysis and specification of the problem being solved. However, the specification is not always sufficiently detailed.  LO3. Very good work displayed in project management developing a project plan that scheduled the student’s own activities and time relating to the project activities and timescale.  LO4. Very good coherently presented background research. Student is able to demonstrate an outstanding critical analysis broader issues and related literature to the project. Background research present, although at times the presentation lacks coherence. Some lacking in breadth of literature review.  LO5. The high-level structure of the software produced and its design are clearly presented. Main design decisions are described, but some justifications are not convincing. Testing of the software almost complete  LO6. A moderately technically difficult and a challenging project. Good development of existing skills. Good development of new skills. Has needed some help by supervisor.  LO7. The student has demonstrated a good understanding and wider consideration to legal, social, ethical and professional issues that relate to the project.  LO8. Well-written and well-organised report. Main themes and issues are clearly identified. Clear appraisal of the project, although the conclusions are not clearly structured.  LO9. The student demonstrated an understanding of the practical material in the viva but not of the all the theoretical aspects. The software has almost all the required and expected features. The software has good performance and is mostly stable and robust. |
| 50-59 | LO1 – LO9. The project is complete, with some work above ’textbook’ standard. A good piece of work carried out to a good standard.  LO1. Good work is shown in demonstrating the selection, justification and the application of appropriate methods, techniques and tools in tackling problems relating to the project.  LO2. Good work demonstrated in the elicitation of the requirements of the project. A clear analysis and specification of the problem being solved demonstrated in most parts. Acceptable analysis and specification of the problem being solved. Both the analysis and specification are not sufficiently well described, but it is still possible to have a relatively clear picture of what has been solved.  LO3. Good work displayed in project management developing a project plan that scheduled the student’s own activities and time relating to the project activities and timescale.  LO4. Background research presently well. Most of the relevant background material is adequately presented. At times the presentation lacks coherence. However, the student is able to demonstrate a good critical analysis of broader issues and related literature to the project.  LO5. The high-level structure of the software produced and its design are adequately presented. However, they are either too brief. Main design decisions are described, but the justifications are not convincing. Almost adequate testing of the software but with a number of missing minor tests.  LO6. A technically sound and a fairly challenging project. Good development of existing skills. Some development of new skills. Has needed some help by supervisor.  LO7. The student has demonstrated a fair understanding and wider consideration to legal, social, ethical and professional issues that relate to the project.  LO8. Adequately written report. Most of the main themes and issues are clearly identified. Most appraisal issues are addressed but the conclusions are brief and at times not informative. Evidence of critical analysis in a few places.  LO9. The student demonstrated an understanding of the practical material in the viva but not the theoretical aspects. The software has acceptable features. The software has acceptable performance and is reasonably stable but not necessarily foolproof or robust. |
| 40-49 | LO1 – LO9. The project is complete, but nothing much above ’textbook’. Overall a fair piece of work but carried out to a minimal standard but sufficient to pass without further work.  LO1. Fair work is shown in demonstrating the selection, justification and the application of appropriate methods, techniques and tools in tackling problems relating to the project.  LO2. Fair work demonstrated in the elicitation of the requirements of the project. A fair analysis and specification of the problem being solved demonstrated in some parts. Both the analysis and specification are not sufficiently well described, and even though it is possible to understand what has been solved in broad terms, a clear picture is missing.  LO3. Fair work displayed in project management developing a project plan that scheduled the student’s own activities and time relating to the project activities and timescale.  LO4. Background research presented basically. Some relevant background material is poorly presented (or is absent). Student is able to demonstrate a basic critical analysis broader issues and related literature to the project in part. Not very original.  LO5. Main design decisions are described, but lacking in justification provided. Some testing of the software but lacking.  LO6. Technically fair and a but not too challenging a project. Minor development of existing skills. Minor development of new skills. Has needed significant help by supervisor.  LO7. The student has demonstrated some understanding and wider consideration to legal, social, ethical and professional issues that relate to the project. However, some of these may be underdeveloped.  LO8. weakly written in part, but still acceptable report. Some of the main themes and issues are not adequately identified. Poorly presented appraisal. The conclusions are brief and mostly non-informative evaluation includes few points but little critical analysis. Some quality work but insufficient in quantity. All sections are covered just competently.  LO9. The student demonstrated an understanding of the practical material in the viva but not the theoretical aspects. The software has minimal to adequate features. The software is possibly weak but not entirely unacceptable, it tends to instability (not entirely) and lacks robustness in part. |
| 30-39 | LO1 – LO9. The project is incomplete and the student has submitted work but cannot evaluate sufficiently. There is at least one section (specification, research, implementation, evaluation) that needs major reworking. A piece of work carried out to a standard that slightly underachieves the minimum standard expected but is recoverable.  LO1. Insufficient work is shown in demonstrating the selection, justification and the application of appropriate methods, techniques and tools in tackling problems relating to the project. However, this is recoverable.  LO2. Insufficient work demonstrated in the elicitation of the requirements of the project. Insufficient analysis and specification of the problem being solved demonstrated. However, all is recoverable.  LO3. Insufficient work displayed in project management developing a project plan that scheduled the student’s own activities and time relating to the project activities and timescale. More time is required to recover some of the activities.  LO4. Background research presentation is very weak (or absent). Student is unable to demonstrate a satisfactory critical analysis broader issues and related literature to the project. Some of the analysis is presented in an incorrect or confusing manner but all is recoverable.  LO5. Some of the main design decisions are weakly described. Testing of the software very incomplete (or minimal) with many missing test cases but recoverable.  LO6. Insufficiently technical or challenging a project as presented but recoverable. Weak in development of existing skills. Development of new skills weak. Has needed significant help by supervisor However, all this is recoverable.  LO7. The student has not demonstrated sufficiently an understanding and wider consideration to legal, social, ethical and professional issues that relate to the project but this is considered recoverable.  LO8. Weakly written, and partly incoherent report. Only a few main themes and issues are clearly identified but recoverable. Appraisal is either incorrectly presented or minimal and needs to improve. The conclusions are non-informative and some are wrong as currently stated.  LO9. The student demonstrated a weak understanding of the work and was unable to explain sufficiently parts of it in the viva. The software has inadequate features. The performance is weak and the software is unstable. |
| 20-29 | LO1 – LO9. A piece of work carried out to a standard that fails to achieve the required standard. The project is significantly incomplete. The project but made very weak effort for a major piece of work and is probably closer to a submitted coursework.  LO1. Significant omissions in work shown in demonstrating the selection, justification and the application of appropriate methods, techniques and tools in tackling problems relating to the project.  LO2. Significant omissions in work demonstrated in the elicitation of the requirements of the project. Significantly poor in analysis and specification of the problem being solved.  LO3. Poor work displayed in project management developing a project plan that scheduled the student’s own activities and time relating to the project activities and timescale. Insufficient time to recover in remaining part of academic year.  LO4. Background research presentation is extremely weak (or absent). Student is unable to demonstrate sufficiently any critical analysis of broader issues and related literature to the project.  LO5. Most of the main design decisions are not described. Testing of the software too incomplete or not present. Appraisal is virtually non-existent.  LO6. Significantly low technically or non-challenging a project as presented. Hardly any development of existing skills. Development of new skills non-significant. Help from the supervisor mostly ignored.  LO7. The student has failed to demonstrate any consideration to the wider consideration to legal, social, ethical and professional issues that relate to the project.  LO8. Very poorly written, and incoherent report. Significantly low main themes and issues identifiable. Very poorly written and incoherent report. The main themes and issues are not clearly identified. Most background material is not presented. Some of the presented background material contains factual errors. Most of the analysis is incorrect or confusing. The conclusions are non-informative and mostly wrong.  LO9. The student demonstrated a poor understanding of the work and was unable to explain parts of it in the viva. The software has considerably fewer features than could be considered adequate. The software is highly unstable. |
| 1-19 | LO1 – LO9. A piece of work carried out to a standard that fails to achieve the required standard significantly. The project is significantly incomplete. Misunderstood point of what the student had to do. The effort is closer to a bad coursework.  LO1. Significantly poor work is shown in demonstrating the selection, justification and the application of appropriate methods, techniques and tools in tackling problems relating to the project.  LO2. Significant omissions in work demonstrated in the elicitation of the requirements of the project. Significantly poor in analysis and specification of the problem being solved.  LO3. Significantly poor work displayed in project management developing a project plan that scheduled the student’s own activities and time relating to the project activities and timescale. Insufficient time to recover in remaining part of academic year.  LO4. Background research presentation is of no real value to the project. Student is unable to demonstrate any critical analysis of broader issues and related literature to the project.  LO5. The main design decisions are not described. Testing of the software too not present. Appraisal is non-existent.  LO6. Insufficiently technical or challenging a project. No development of existing skills. No Development of new skills. Help from the supervisor ignored or not sought.  LO7. The student has significantly failed to mention any of the wider consideration to legal, social, ethical and professional issues that relate to the project.  LO8. Very poorly written and incoherent report. The main themes and issues are not identified at all. Most background material is not presented. Most of the presented background material contains factual errors. The analysis is incorrect or confusing. Main design decisions are not described. Testing of the software too incomplete or not present. No appraisal. No conclusions, or the conclusions are wrong.  LO9. The student demonstrated a poor understanding of the work and was unable to explain parts of it in the viva. The software does not do almost anything useful and has almost no appropriate features, if any. |
| 1 | In cases of proven plagiarism to indicate attempt |
| 0 | Only in cases of non-submission |

**1**