B.Sc. Professional Project (COM3001)
Final Submission – Assessment Form

Student Name: Chara Katiri URN: 6166668

Description	*Grade*
Literature/technology review: [10%]	
Literature search / review of technologies contains a generalized overview of the topic, and unclear relevance. References may have missing details.	Help 40%
Problem Analysis & Design Choices: [20%]	
Evidence of some problem analysis. Demonstrated basic technical awareness in discussion of design issues & justification of choices made (for development) or existing results & justification of choice of experiments (for research).	Help 50%
Design documentation: [20%]	
Little to no documentation of chosen design (for development), or theoretical / experimental work (for research)	Help 20%
Evaluation of outputs / testing: [20%]	
Poor or missing evaluation of what has been achieved, in terms of program testing (for development) or theoretical / experimental results (for research).	Help 0%
Critical review of project outcomes: [10%]	
Poor or missing evaluation of what has been achieved, in terms of meeting the project objectives.	Help 0%
Report style: [5%]	
Orderly design and structure. May be unbalanced in presentation or have a tendency to generalization.	Help 50%
Presentation of results / Demonstration: [10%]	
Development: No adequate working system was presented. Attempts on smaller pieces of code inadequate. Research: Little or no results presented.	Help 0%
Presentation style: [5%]	
Poor presentation and structure.	Help 0%

Overall Grade: 21%

Briefly justify the overall grade, and give additional feedback.

Overall a good start. Nice version history and table of abbreviations/

Chapter 1: Not sure whether the ROI is relevant as we are not really starting a company... Does the Pinboard only allow second hand books + rooms/houses to be advertised or are other products possible, too? This is not quite clear.
Expand the Project Objectives and aims a bit to include some more of your own goals. I also thought that one of the objectives was to use CSS to make the site available to web/mobile.

Chapter 2: Look at some open source alternatives as well, eg Apache OfBiz and OsCommerce (see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparison_of_free_software_e-commerce_web_application_frameworks
)
The Spring review needs to be put in context, eg why is Spring better than plain Java EE?
Swap the first 2 sections in 2.4.2 as the MVC part is required to understand the DispatcherServlet. Also make sure you explain how the controller of MVC relates to the controller in Spring.

Examiner: Steve Wesemeyer Date: 10/04/15

Tick here to indicate that the Turnitin report has been checked: ☐

Instructions for Examiners

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

This form is to be filled in independently by each allocated examiner, without any prior input from the supervisor or any other 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 9 Jun 2014, 16:00.*

You are also asked to check the Turnitin report on SurreyLearn. If you suspect academic misconduct, compile the necessary evidence and forward the case to the Academic Integrity Officer by not later than Mon 9 Jun 2014, 16:00. The AIO will then decide if there is a *prima facie* case and if so proceed from there. *Note that in this case you are still required to submit this assessment as above, assuming no academic misconduct has taken place.*

Instructions for Students

This form will not be returned to you; it is kept by the University to document internal processing. All grades are to be considered provisional until Board of Examiners approval.

Marking Criteria

Grade	*Description*

Literature/technology review: [10%]

0%–39%:	Literature search / review of technologies has little relevance to the topic. Insufficient in terms of breadth and/or depth. References often have missing details.
40%–49%:	Literature search / review of technologies contains a generalized overview of the topic, and unclear relevance. References may have missing details.
50%–59%:	Literature search / review of technologies contains a good overview of relevant theory and techniques, but no justification of relevance. References are generally complete and correct.
60%–69%:	Literature search / review of technologies is a good review of relevant reference material and techniques. References are complete and correct.
70%–79%:	Literature search / review of technologies is a good review of relevant material, including some research papers or other advanced material. References are complete and correct.
80%–100%:	Literature search / review of technologies is a good review of relevant material, including a range of research papers or other advanced material. References are complete and correct.

Problem Analysis & Design Choices: [20%]

0%–39%:	Little to no evidence of technical work. No discussion of design issues & justification of choices made (for development) or existing results & justification of choice of experiments (for research).
40%–49%:	Little evidence of problem analysis. Hardly any discussion of design issues & justification of choices made (for development) or existing results & justification of choice of experiments (for research).
50%–59%:	Evidence of some problem analysis. Demonstrated basic technical awareness in discussion of design issues & justification of choices made (for development) or existing results & justification of choice of experiments (for research).
60%–69%:	Good evidence of problem analysis. Satisfactory discussion of design issues & justification of choices made (for development) or existing results & justification of choice of experiments (for research).
70%–79%:	Extensive evidence of problem analysis. Excellent discussion of design issues & justification of choices made (for development) or existing results & justification of choice of experiments (for research).
80%–100%:	Extensive evidence of problem analysis. Excellent discussion of design issues & justification of choices made (for development) or existing results & justification of choice of experiments (for research). Demonstrated innovation in approach.

Design documentation: [20%]

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

Grade	*Description*
0%–39%:	Little to no documentation of chosen design (for development), or theoretical / experimental work (for research).
40%–49%:	Minimal attempt to document the chosen design (for development), or theoretical / experimental work (for research).
50%–59%:	Basic documentation of the chosen design (for development), or theoretical / experimental work (for research). Generally lacking in thoroughness.
60%–69%:	Good documentation of the chosen design (for development), or theoretical / experimental work (for research). Some incoherence of argumentation or narrow scope.
70%–79%:	Excellent documentation of the chosen design (for development), or theoretical / experimental work (for research). Thorough discussion of challenging aspects.
80%–100%:	Excellent documentation of the chosen design (for development), or theoretical / experimental work (for research). Thorough discussion of challenging aspects. Shows originality, is highly professional, or deep understanding of implications.

Evaluation of outputs / testing: [20%]

0%–39%:	Poor or missing evaluation of what has been achieved, in terms of program testing (for development) or theoretical / experimental results (for research).
40%–49%:	Partial evaluation of what has been achieved, in terms of program testing (for development) or theoretical / experimental results (for research).
50%–59%:	Basic evaluation of what has been achieved, in terms of program testing (for development) or theoretical / experimental results (for research).
60%–69%:	Good evaluation of what has been achieved, in terms of program testing (for development) or theoretical / experimental results (for research).
70%–79%:	Excellent evaluation of what has been achieved, in terms of program testing (for development) or theoretical / experimental results (for research).
80%–100%:	Excellent evaluation of what has been achieved, in terms of program testing (for development) or theoretical / experimental results (for research). Demonstrates thoroughness and greater insight and understanding.

Critical review of project outcomes: [10%]

0%–39%:	Poor or missing evaluation of what has been achieved, in terms of meeting the project objectives.
40%–49%:	Partial evaluation of what has been achieved, in terms of meeting the project objectives.
50%–59%:	Basic evaluation of what has been achieved, in terms of meeting the project objectives.
60%–69%:	Good evaluation of what has been achieved, in terms of meeting the project objectives.
70%–79%:	Excellent evaluation of what has been achieved, in terms of meeting the project objectives. Clear link between documented results and objectives.
80%–100%:	Excellent evaluation of what has been achieved, in terms of meeting the project objectives. Clear link between documented results and objectives. Demonstrates thoroughness in evaluation.

Report style: [5%]

0%–39%:	Very poor or non-existent design and structure. English may be so poor it hinders the reader's understanding.
40%–49%:	Poor design and structure, difficult to read. Some inconsistencies in style.
50%–59%:	Orderly design and structure. May be unbalanced in presentation or have a tendency to generalization.
60%–69%:	Clear design, logically structured, with few shortcomings.
70%–79%:	Good design, logically structured. Balanced presentation.
80%–100%:	Excellent design, logically structured. Balanced presentation. Abstract can be read independently.

Presentation of results / Demonstration: [10%]

0%–39%:	Development: No adequate working system was presented. Attempts on smaller pieces of code inadequate. Research: Little or no results presented.
40%–49%:	Development: Working system was demonstrated, but not in a structured way, or parts of system that were completed were demonstrated but unclear. Research: Results obtained were presented, but in an unclear or unstructured way.

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

Grade	*Description*
50%–59%:	Development: Working system was demonstrated in a structured way, or parts of system that were completed were demonstrated systematically. Research: Results obtained were presented in a clear and structured way.
60%–69%:	Working system (for development) or results obtained (for research) presented in a structured way, with main parts highlighted.
70%–79%:	Working system (for development) or results obtained (for research) presented in a structured way, with main parts highlighted, and a good technical explanation of the algorithms / application structure (for development) or the experiments carried out (for research).
80%–100%:	Working system (for development) or results obtained (for research) presented in a structured way, with main parts highlighted, and a good technical explanation of the algorithms / application structure (for development) or the experiments carried out (for research). Showed understanding of impact of technologies used.

Presentation style: [5%]

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.