B.Sc. Professional Project (COM3001)
Interim Discussion – Assessment Form

Student Name: Chara KATIRI

URN: 6166668

Description   Pinboard website

Grade

Background knowledge: [25%]
Comparison with similar service is appropriate. A better suite will be to compare with Gumtree.

Evidence of technical investigation: [25%]
Good evidence of technical investigation. The student seems to be aware of challenges and learning curve with her project.

Planning: [20%]

Discussion / Answering questions: [20%]
The discussion showed that the student has a clear understanding of her project objectives and challanges.

Presentation style: [10%]
Good presentation slides very well presented.

Indicative Grade: *70%*

Give formative feedback, including suggestions for further progress on this project.

The student seems to be very well motivated and supported by her advisor. I believe she will have no problem to carry out her project.

To make the application more friendly it would be nice if users could use directly their email account in order to post items to the virtual pinboard.

A more suitable name for spam in this context, may be junk.

Examiner:

Date: 16/12/2014

Instructions for Examiners

Use only genuine Adobe Acrobat Reader software to edit this document.

A single copy of this form is to be filled in by the allocated examiner. Please make sure to fill in the student name and URN exactly as on the official University record; these can be obtained from the supervision allocation table on SurreyLearn. The completed form is to be returned electronically, at `http://com3001.cs.surrey.ac.uk/assessment/submit.html`. *This needs to be completed by Mon 16 Dec 2014, 16:00.* A copy will be returned to the student and supervisor by the Undergraduate Projects Coordinator.

Instructions for Students

This form will be returned to you by email. Any grade given on this form is as an indication of your current progress with the project, and has no bearing on the final grade obtained for the project.

Marking Criteria

Grade	Description

Background knowledge: [25%]

0%–39%: Literature search / review of technologies has little relevance to the topic. Insufficient in terms of breadth and/or depth.

40%–49%: Literature search / review of technologies contains a generalized overview of the topic, and unclear relevance.

50%–59%: Literature search / review of technologies contains a good overview of relevant theory and techniques, but no justification of relevance.

60%–69%: Literature search / review of technologies is a good review of relevant reference material and techniques.

70%–79%: Literature search / review of technologies is a good review of relevant material, including some research papers or other advanced material.

80%–100%: Literature search / review of technologies is a good review of relevant material, including a range of research papers or other advanced material.

Evidence of technical investigation: [25%]

0%–39%: Little technical work has been completed so far. No evidence of initial development work (for development) or preliminary experiments/results (for research).

40%–49%: Little evidence of initial development work (for development) or preliminary experiments/results (for research).

50%–59%: Evidence of some initial development work (for development) or preliminary experiments/results (for research).

60%–69%: Good evidence of initial development work (for development) or preliminary experiments/results (for research).

70%–79%: Extensive evidence of initial development work (for development) or preliminary experiments/results (for research).

80%–100%: Extensive evidence of initial development work (for development) or preliminary experiments/results (for research). Demonstrated innovation in approach.

Planning: [20%]

0%–39%: Inadequate project plan included. No evaluation of project objectives.

40%–49%: Poor planning. No evaluation of project objectives.

50%–59%: Project plan included, but success depends on last few activities. Time allowed for write-up. Minimal evaluation of project objectives.

60%–69%: Clear project plan with achievable chunks of work and identified dependencies. Time allowed for write-up. Good evaluation of project objectives.

70%–79%: Clear project plan with achievable chunks of work. Schedule ensures early concrete results and iterative improvement. Time allowed for write-up and for supervisor to read drafts. Good evaluation of project objectives.

80%–100%: Clear project plan with achievable chunks of work. Schedule ensures early concrete results and iterative improvement. Time allowed for write-up and for supervisor to read drafts. Clear progress monitoring during project. Good evaluation of project objectives.

Discussion / Answering questions: [20%]

0%–39%: Found it difficult to answer questions on fundamental technical concepts. Tended to generalize answers.

40%–49%: Limited discussion on technical issues, with a tendency to generalize. Limited reference to what was actually attempted.

50%–59%: Limited discussion on technical issues. Demonstrated appreciation of where technical issues and difficulties arose.

(Continued on next page)

Grade	Description
60%–69%:	Satisfactory answering of technical questions. Demonstrated understanding of fundamental technical concepts.
70%–79%:	Good responses to technical questions. Demonstrated understanding of fundamental technical concepts. Student did not steer discussion.
80%–100%:	Student fully engaged in a mature and insightful discussion of technical issues. Demonstrated ability to lead the discussion.

Presentation style: [10%]

Grade	Description
0%–39%:	Poor presentation and structure.
40%–49%:	Poor presentation and structure.
50%–59%:	Orderly presentation and structure.
60%–69%:	Clear presentation, logically structured, with few shortcomings.
70%–79%:	Good presentation, logically structured.
80%–100%:	Excellent presentation, logically structured, and well explained.