**COMP4 Coursework Feedback and Marking**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Analysis (12 marks)** | **Draft Mark** | **Final Mark** |
| 8 |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall** |
| * Evidence of an extensive, well-structured investigation * System requirements (objectives) not comprehensive enough * End user’s needs are addressed * Objectives are not SMART |

|  |
| --- |
| **Complexity** |
| Complex problem (possibly too complex!) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Layout** |
| **Strengths** |
|  |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

1. Introduction

|  |
| --- |
| **1.1 Client Identification** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Clear client identification |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **1.2 Definition of Current System** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Clear definition |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **1.3 Description of Problems** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Written description is good |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
| * Far more evidence of the existing system is needed in the appendix. It’s difficult to visualise the problems being described without seeing the actual screens being talked about – Just seen that these are at the end of section 2.1. Please refer to section 2.1 from here. * A bullet-pointed summary of the problems identified would make it a lot clearer |

2. Investigation

|  |
| --- |
| **2.1 The current system** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Good evidence of the current system |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
| * Need to add a key for the data flow diagrams * Data sources and destinations refers to ‘User’, ‘Administrator’ and ‘System’. The same terminology should be used elsewhere, e.g. data flow diagrams |

|  |
| --- |
| **2.2 The proposed system** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Good use of validation in data dictionary |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
| * Need an alternative solution for the face blob in volumetrics. Do you really need 7600 different faces? Could you store 10 different types of face and then store an index to the face you’ll need to show? |

3. Objectives

|  |
| --- |
| **3.1 General objectives** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Some good general objectives |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.2 Specific objectives** |
| **Strengths** |
|  |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
| * Some of these are too general. According to the marks scheme, objectives should be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-based. For example, “To make the database easy to access” is far too subjective to be actually achievable. Another example, instead of “to include a range of topics” you could have “to include topics X, Y and Z”. Be specific. |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.3 Core objectives** |
| **Strengths** |
|  |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.4 Other objectives** |
| **Strengths** |
|  |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

4. ER Diagrams and Descriptions

|  |
| --- |
| **4.1 ER Diagram** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Very clear diagram |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **4.2 Entity Descriptions** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Good identification of attributes |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
| * Description is just saying what the relationships are. Would be better to say what one record of each table describes. |

5. Object Analysis

|  |
| --- |
| **5.1 Object listing** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Objects identified |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **5.2 Relationship diagrams** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Good diagram |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
| * Missing line from DragAndDrop Question |

|  |
| --- |
| **5.3 Class definitions** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Clearly identified |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

6. Other Abstractions and Graphs

|  |
| --- |
| **6.1 Other Abstractions and Graphs** |
| **Strengths** |
|  |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

7. Constraints

|  |
| --- |
| **7.1 Hardware** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Hardware constraints identified |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **7.2 Software** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Software constraints identified |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **7.3 Time** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Time constraints identified |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **7.4 User knowledge** |
| **Strengths** |
| * User knowledge constraints identified |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
| * Could make a bigger thing of the user manual |

|  |
| --- |
| **7.5 Access restrictions** |
| **Strengths** |
|  |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
| * What about access to the PCs your end user will be using? You might also have restrictions about installing software on those PCs. |

8. Limitations

|  |
| --- |
| **8.1 Areas which will not be included in computerisation** |
| **Strengths** |
|  |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **8.2 Areas considered for future computerisation** |
| **Strengths** |
|  |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

9. Solutions

|  |
| --- |
| **9.1 Alternative solutions** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Alternatives identified |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **9.2 Justification of chosen solution** |
| **Strengths** |
| * Clear justification |
| **Areas requiring improvement** |
| * If you’re going to add 3D graphics with OpenGL, then **THIS PROJECT IS PROBABLY TOO AMBITIOUS**! Adding OpenGL to a solution which is already a database plus PyQt will add hardly anything in the way of marks (if any), but will add a significant amount of time to implementation. Highly recommended that you ditch 3D graphics. Usage of 3D graphics is also not mentioned at all in your objectives. |