**Module: BSc Hons Computing Dissertation Assignment 2**

**2024-25**

**Submission Date: *01st Aug 2025 @ 2359***

**Assignment:** This assignment covers Learning Outcomes 2-5

**PLEASE READ ALL INSTRUCTIONS AND INFORMATION CAREFULLY.**

This assignment contributes 70% of your final module mark. This assignment is to be attempted on an individual basis with no collusion with other peers within the group.

Please ensure that you retain a duplicate/copy of your assignment. Occasionally we are required to send samples of student work to the external examiners for moderation purposes. It will also safeguard you in the unlikely event of your work going astray.

**IMPORTANT INFORMATION**

You are required to submit your work within the bounds of the Assessment Regulations (see your Student handbook). Plagiarism, paraphrasing and downloading large amounts of information from external sources, will not be tolerated and will be dealt with severely. Although you should make full use of any source material, which would normally be an occasional sentence and/or paragraph (referenced) followed by your own critical analysis/evaluation. You will receive no marks for work that is not your own. Your work may be subject to checks for originality which can include use of an electronic plagiarism detection service. Where you are asked to submit an individual piece of work, the work must be entirely your own. The safety of your assessments is your responsibility. You must not permit another student access to your work.

**Student Requirements**

For this assignment you are required to supply the following:

**Assignment 2** (this assignment contributes to **70%** of your final module mark. It will be marked out of 100)

You have been supplied with the scenario and existing forms. Your tasks at this stage of the course work are to produce a report containing:

1. **Official UHI Assignment Cover Front Page**
2. **Carrying out an in-depth investigation of the context and literature and, where appropriate, other similar products. (20%)**
3. **Identifying, selecting and applying appropriate tools, techniques and approaches relevant to the project (Methodology)** **(10%)**
4. **Producing a set of deliverables by which the success of the piece of work can be judged (20%)**

Marking should address the following:

* Does the deliverable meet the aims and objectives of the project specification?
* Were the correct processes (methods) used?
* Has the success of the project been measured?
* What is the quality of the deliverable?
* What is the difficulty of the deliverable?
* How complete is the deliverable?

1. **Research, critically reflect on and clearly communicate issues relevant to project success (10%)**
2. **Research, critically reflect on and clearly communicate issues relevant to professional and ethical concerns and aspects of personal development planning (PDP) (5%)**
3. **Quality of report and referencing (in-text citations & bibliography) (5%)**

**Submission Instructions**

* The submission should contain suitable references which are cited in the main text (using the recognised UHI referencing system).
* You must submit all documentation in the assessment folder on Brightspace. All files should be zipped into a single file for the drop box, the name the file studentid\_DissAssignment2.zip. So, for example if your Student Id is: 01234567 then the file name will be **01234567\_DissAssignment2.zip**

**General Information that applies to this assignment**

Copies of your files, assets and any relevant  **accompanying documentation** (it is mandatory that you include a USER GUIDE to aid installation) which should be submitted in the assessment folder on the Brightspace Portal. If the documentation, such as wireframes, is not in the Dissertation or Appendices please zip it up.

These files should be zipped into a single file for the drop box. Name the file Studentid\_DissAssignment2.zip.

**Marking Scheme**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Student ID: | | 21010093 | | |  | A | 70-100 |
|  |  | Level: 10 | Supervisor Name: | | | Magnus Tullock |  | B | 60-69 |
| Module Title: | | Dissertation: Computing | | | | |  | C | 50-59 |
| Module Weighting: | | 70% | Assessment: | | 2 | |  | D | 40-49 |
| Final Date for Submission: | | | **13th May 2022. 1159pm** | | | |  | **E** | **0-39** |
| Days Late: | | |  | | | |  | **Final Grade:** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria/Mark** | | **A** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **Fail** |
| Carrying out an in-depth investigation of the context, a review of relevant literature and, where appropriate, other similar products, i.e., due diligence.  **20%** | | Excellent, in depth reporting on the background and context of the project. Extensive range of resources in the references and bibliography which are all reliable and appropriate. All dimensions of your project are considered. | Very good, in depth reporting on the background and context of the project. An almost extensive range of resources in the references and bibliography which are mostly reliable and appropriate. Nearly all dimensions of your project are considered. | Good investigation of background and context.  Good range of resources in the references and bibliography which are generally reliable and appropriate. | Adequate investigation of background and context. Typical range of resources in the references and bibliography which are generally reliable/appropriate. | Only partial investigation has taken place.  Bibliography and resources used are limited and in places unreliable or questionable. | There is very little in the way of investigation or research. Project decisions are not based on research. |
|  | | **80+** | **70 - 79** | **60-69** | **50-59** | **40-49** | **0-39** |
| Identifying, selecting and applying appropriate tools, techniques and approaches relevant to the project (Methodology, Analysis, Results sections).  **10%** | | An exceptional variety of relevant approaches (software, hardware, techniques, systems etc.) are clearly discussed and justified. Exceptional originality is shown.  **80+** | A very good variety of relevant approaches (software, hardware, techniques, systems etc.) are mostly clearly discussed and justified. Very good originality is shown  **70 - 79** | Tools and techniques are chosen, with a good range of suggestions and reasoned discussion for their use. There is some originality.  **60-69** | Tools and techniques chosen are clearly described but are limited in scope, either in depth or number.  **50-59** | Tools and techniques are chosen but there is little reasoning and little justification for the choices made.  **40-49** | Tools chosen are not appropriate. No discussion of reasons behind the choices made.  **0-39** |
| Producing a set of deliverables by which the success of the piece of work can be judged **20%**  Marking should address the following:   * Does the deliverable meet the aims and objectives of the project specification? * Were the correct processes (methods) used? * Has the success of the project been measured? * What is the quality of the deliverable? * What is the difficulty of the deliverable?   How complete is the deliverable? | | The deliverable is of exceptional quality. The creation of the deliverable is related back to the specification, the users/project objective and the chosen processes. The success or otherwise of the deliverable is measured in a scientific and reliable manner.  **80+** | The deliverable is of very good quality and appropriate alternatives have been considered and correctly discarded. It meets nearly all the requirements of both the project and the end users/project objective. The evidence of success has been almost been fully delivered in a scientific and reliable manner.  **70 - 79** | The deliverable is of good quality and many alternatives have been considered and correctly discarded. It meets the requirements of both the project and the end users but the proof of this has not been suitably handled.  **60-69** | The deliverable is of a good quality but it does not fully meet the aims and objectives of the project specification. It meets most of the aims but alternatives have not been considered.  **50-59** | The deliverable is poor and only just meets the requirements of the project. The reasons for design, functionality, interface and general presentation decisions are not obvious.  **40-49** | The deliverable does not work and/or does not meet the aims of the project.  **0-39** |
| Research, critically reflect on and clearly communicate issues relevant to project success, such as pitfalls avoided and/or problems encountered **(10%)** | | The critical analysis and reflection discussion is excellent. It covers all areas (from specification to final deliverable). It also discusses exciting and original ideas for future developments and clearly explains how these may be achieved. Any weaknesses found are extremely subtle.  **80+** | The critical analysis and reflection on the project is very good and covers all relevant areas of the project. The further work section is quite extensive and offers good insights. The analysis is very good and the feasibility of some of the extensions has been almost fully justified  **70 - 79** | The critical analysis and reflection is good and covers all relevant areas of the project. The further work section is extensive and insightful. However, weaknesses in the analysis can be found and the feasibility of some of the extensions has not been completely justified.  **60-69** | The critical analysis is good but does not cover all areas of the project. It is backed up by examples. Further work suggestions are good but are relatively obvious and could be extended.  **50-59** | An attempt at critical analysis of the project. Any discussion is not backed by examples or reasons. The suggestions for further work are weak and not put in context.  **40-49** | Very little or no critique and/or reflection has taken place. No examples are given and suggestions for further work are poor.  **0-39** |
| Research, critically reflect on and clearly communicate issues relevant to professional and ethical concerns and aspects of personal development planning (PDP). Section named Critical Reflection. **(5%)** | | A good attempt at discussing the personal and professional learning that has taken place but weak examples are given.  Ethical considerations are treated more seriously and do not come across as an afterthought but they are not related back to project examples. | A very good attempt at discussing the personal and professional learning that has taken place in the project backed up by relevant examples.  Ethical considerations are treated more seriously and their impact on the project is made clear. | A good attempt at discussing the personal and professional learning that has taken place backed up by relevant examples.  Ethical considerations are treated more seriously and their impact on the project is made clear. | A good attempt at discussing the personal and professional learning that has taken place but weak examples are given.  Ethical considerations are treated more seriously and do not come across as an afterthought but they are not related back to project examples. | Some attempt at discussing the personal and professional learning and development that has taken place as a result of doing the project. No real insights.  Ethical considerations are weak and come across as an afterthought. | Very little or no attempt at discussion personal and/or professional development. Ethics are not discussed. |
| **80+** | **70-79** | **60-69** | **50-59** | **40-49** | **0-39** |
| Quality of report and referencing (in-text citations & bibliography) **(5%)** | | The report is exceptional and error-free, a pleasure to read and has a very wide range of references.  **80+** | **70-79** | The report is mainly very good and error-free. References are varied but not as extensive as they could be.  **60-69** | There are multiple errors in the report. The range of references is weak.  **50-59** | The errors in the report detract from the meaning. References are poor.  **40-49** | An unfinished and/or error ridden piece of written work has been submitted.  **0-39** |
|  | **Lecturer Comments:**  **Second Marker Comments:** | | | | | | |



**Assignment 2**

**Cover Sheet**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Module title:** | Dissertation: Computing | | |
| **Module code**: |  | **Word-count:** | 12000 +10% |
| **Date due:** | **1st Aug 2025: 1159 pm** | **Date submitted:** | 01/08/2025 |
| **Student candidate number:** | 21010093 | | |

**This assessment is worth 70% of the total available module marks**.

**Completing your assessment:**

You must submit all documentation in the Dissertation assignments area on the VLE Brightspace. All files should be zipped into a single file for the drop box, the name the file 01234567\_DissAssignment2.zip. So, for example if your Student Id is: 01234567 then the file name will be 01234567\_ DissAssignment2.zip

**Declaration of originality and authorisation to hold this assessment electronically and verify that it is original:**

UHI recognises that plagiarism, where deliberately engaged in, is unacceptable and is considered serious academic malpractice. **Students are responsible for ensuring the work they submit through TurnitInUK is their own**. If you have any queries you should contact your Tutor or PAT before submitting your assessment.

**By submitting this assessment I declare that the attached piece of work is my own**. I have acknowledged all the sources I have consulted and where I have used words which are not my own, I have clearly indicated this in the references.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student candidate number:** | 21010093 | **Date:** | 01/08/2025 |