**B.Sc. (Hons.) Computer Science**
**Final Year Project**

# Final Submissions Assessment Marking Sheet

## Overview

The FYP requires students to propose, design, implement, test, document and present a complex software project to demonstrate the level of knowledge gained over the course of their studies. The project must be an independent piece of work, which is both coherent and well structured. The student is expected to be self-motivated so as to drive this work through to completion. They are expected to identify the key areas of the project and to make real decisions that will ultimately affect the end deliverable. The project deliverable will be an assessable, independent body of work that will demonstrate the student's ability to work on their own and their ability to communicate key aspects of the project.

The FYP includes all aspects of software development including, but not limited to; Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation Integration, Documentation and Maintenance. Critically researching an area of Computing includes the correct use of the Scientific Method; using a well designed, defined and identified research method (qualitative, quantitative or a mixture of both); well-designed data collection and analysis (if applicable) and critical analysis of their research process. In either case the student undertakes a project, which follows a prescribed method and requires them to evaluate the outcomes critically.

## Marking Guidelines

The final submission is marked out of 100. The final submission is worth 80% of the overall FYP mark.

Plagiarism is a serious offence that will result in zero marks. In addition, the student might be asked to present to an investigative panel.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1st | Perfect | 90-100 | The student went above and beyond with the FYP. The project already displays excellence and complexity on all levels, and the objectives of the FYP as a whole have been far surpassed. The project demonstrates that a real intellectual challenge is being attempted. The whole FYP successfully discusses all elements of the scope and provides critical analysis and discussion of achievements. |
| | Outstanding | 80-89 | The student presented a very strong FYP submission. The project itself is either highly innovative or aims to provide a solution for a particular niche. The software and report deliverables are of excellent standard. The whole FYP successfully discusses all elements of the scope and provides critical analysis and discussion of achievements. |
| | Excellent | 70-79 | The student presented a good, solid FYP that demonstrates continuous engagement and high quality deliveries, though the project is more mainstream than the higher categories. The submission successfully discusses all elements of the scope and provides critical analysis and discussion of achievements. |
| 2.1 | Good | 60-69 | A very good FYP submission, with a complete scope and several areas of complexity and strong critical discussion. The project lacks intellectual challenge or innovation to push it into the first category. |
| 2.2 | Satisfactory | 50-59 | The student presents a solid FYP that overall works well. A project in this category lacks a distinct challenge and is the software is lacking finish or several features have not been implemented. Overall the student has implemented mainstream technologies without strong complexity. The report is of average quality. |
| Pass | Weak | 40-49 | The student presented an FYP that is largely lacking of complexity and challenge. There is either no software of any kind, has not progressed from the initial proof-of-concept in December, or the software is of such low quality or complexity that it cannot be considered as FYP standard. Nevertheless, several use cases have been successfully thought out. |
| Fail | Fail | <40 | The FYP demonstrates that the student has so far not been able to provide a working software or project as a whole. The student might have failed to engage with the FYP process. The submissions might be incomplete. There is a clear lack of understanding and/or engagement. |

**B.Sc. (Hons.) Computer Science** **Final Submissions Assessment Marking Sheet**

**Final Year Project**

## Comments

The primary aim of comments is to provide feedback on grading decisions. Consequently, it is helpful throughout the form to highlight any significant issues worth of note to support grade decisions. Bear in mind that the marking sheet can be viewed by students and external examiners.

Typical sample qualitative terms include but are not limited to:
trivial, acceptable, moderate, advanced, excellent, perfect.

| trivial | acceptable | moderate | advanced | excellent | perfect |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0-9 | 10-12 | 13-14 | 15-17 | 18-19 | 20-25 |
| 0-7 | 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-13 | 14-15 | 16-20 |
| 0-3 | 4-5 | 6-7 | 8-9 | 10-11 | 12-15 |
| 0 | 1-2 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-8 | 9-10 |

**The mark should relate to the project comment and should be constructive in that it gives the students an indication as to how improvements can be made.**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Quality of Outcome | 25 | • The extent of the student's ability to show critical and independent through with clear identification of weaknesses and strengths<br>• The extent of completeness of the student's work<br>• The extent of complexity of the student's work<br>• And excellent student in this category presents a complex project with a complete implementation and good, thorough critical analysis with a deep understanding of strengths and weaknesses of the project and the approach taken.<br>• Innovation is considered in this category. |
| 2 | Design and Methodology | 20 | • The extent to which the student has successfully specified the scope, identified detailed functionality, and confirmed the choice of technologies for their project.<br>• The complexity and type of the project dictates which design and methodology elements are important for this FYP. |
| 3 | Research and Background Knowledge | 20 | • The extent of the student's background research and primary research (if relevant) and quality and breadth of references<br>• The student's knowledge and understanding of current work in the project area<br>• The student's ability to draw conclusions and informed decisions |
| 4 | Project Management | 15 | • Engagement with supervisor/academic advisors<br>• Consistency of submissions and quality of meeting logs<br>• Being proactive<br>• Procurement or contingency of required resources<br>• Project plan, formulation, maintenance + adherence |
| 5 | Demo and Presentation | 10 | • Ability to present and defend their project<br>• Plan for demo |
| 6 | Technical Writing | 10 | • Ability to articulate ideas<br>• Spelling, grammar and correct referencing<br>• Adherence to template and organisation of content |

B.Sc. (Hons.) Computer Science
Final Year Project

# Final Submissions Assessment Marking Sheet

| | |
|---|---|
| **Student Name:** | **Project Title:** |
| **Supervisor Name:** | **Second Reader Name:** |
| *Please tick to indicate that you have read and understood the marking sheet instructions:* | |
| ❑ *Supervisor* | ❑ *Second Reader* |

| | **Category** | **Weight** | **Comments** | **Mark** | **Avg Mark** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Quality of Outcome** | **25** | Supervisor: | | |
| | | | Second Reader: | | |
| 2 | **Design and Methodology** | **20** | Supervisor: | | |
| | | | Second Reader: | | |
| 3 | **Research and Background Knowledge** | **20** | Supervisor: | | |
| | | | Second Reader: | | |
| 4 | **Project Management** | **15** | Supervisor: | | |
| | | | Second Reader: | | |
| 5 | **Demo and Presentation** | **10** | Supervisor: | | |
| | | | Second Reader: | | |
| 6 | **Technical Writing** | **10** | Supervisor: | | |
| | | | Second Reader: | | |
| | Totals | 100 | **Student's Overall Mark** | | |