4005CEM Report Marking and Feedback Sheet

Participant Number:

3482867

Element	Maximum Mark	Awarded Mark
Content 70%		
An answer to the following question, together with a justification for the decision: In its current form, it is a traditional database. Should you keep it that way?	5	**4**
A main body detailing the process of implementing the database using SQL, including:		
- normalisation of the table (should that be required)	15	**3**
- the identification of the attributes	5	**1**
- the Entity-Relationship Diagram	10	**5**
- use of SQL commands in order to create and populate the tables with data	10	**7**
Reflection and justification of the process for deriving above:		
- justification of the database design steps	10	**5**
- reflection on the coursework and work as a whole	5	**0**
References and correct in text citation - at least 3 references, including books, journals or conference papers	10	**5**
Format 30%		
Spelling, grammar, scientific writing	7	**5**
Consistent formatting (font size, colour, type, alignment)	6	**6**
1000 words (+/- 10%)	4	**4**
Graphics, tables, visual aids, etc.	6	**4**
Adopting an appropriate template (title page, table of contents, acronyms, table of figures, introduction, main body, reflection, conclusion, references)	7	**5**

TOTAL MARK (out of 100)	**54**
SCALED MARK (out of 70)	**37.8**

Feedback:

Some anomalies identified with existing system. No discussion of why it's not a traditional database in its current form. Steps of normalisation are incorrect. Key definition not correct.
There is no need to create additional IDs. Repeated data being stored (date). Datatypes not justified. OK attempt at ER diagram. Missing data lengths in SQL

In-text citations not formatted correctly. Online resources only. Use a wider variety of resources. No reflection given.

No title page. Contents page and table of figures included. Be good to number section headings. Consistent formatting.