Submission 2 - your project

This is the final submission for your course and worth 70%. Please submit individually your report, version control logs and any additional files that you think are relevant. You will be assessed based on the content of the report, though the additional files may be used to verify. You should, at the very least, submit a working prototype of your project.

📄 rubric_pt_2.pdf   8 October 2020, 12:25 PM

Submission status

Submission status	Submitted for grading
Grading status	Graded
Due date	Friday, 9 April 2021, 11:59 PM
Time remaining	Assignment was submitted 13 days 20 hours late
Last modified	Friday, 23 April 2021, 8:39 PM
Submission comments	▶ Comments (0)

Edit submission   Remove submission

You can still make changes to your submission.

Feedback

Grade	60 / 70
Graded on	Thursday, 10 June 2021, 9:19 PM
Graded by	Sean McGrath

Feedback comments —

 The code solves all of the challenges set out in the aims/objectives. The iterative approach is rigorous and clearly identifies steps and stages, including rhetoric around how and why choices have been made. The approach is clear, logical and sensible. The code is readable, with sensible commenting and structure throughout. The approach is sensible and clearly identifies disparate components of the system. There is evidence of systematic approach in terms of reflection and/or collaboration. There is some evidence of reflection on critical steps and stages of the project. Exceptional work with clear technical merit. The proposition has exceptional technical merit, utilising contemporary techniques that are fit for purpose. All parts of the system work well and where parts do not work there is an involved discussion to explain how/why. Test cases are appropriate, build on previous testing and fit for purpose. There is a valid attempt to handle errors at different levels (e.g. try-> catch statements.). There is evidence of systematic testing. There is a good justification for testing. There is some evidence of user feedback to inform design decisions. There is some evidence of engaging with external resources. Both the problem and the analysis are rigorously investigated. Ideas and concepts are presented clearly and in a coherent manner. Design decisions are justified throughout with evidence based reasoning. The discussion is rigorous, systematic and there is a clear rhetoric defining problems and the appropriateness of solutions. The documentation and/or user guide provided is fit for purpose. The student follows good practice for referencing, though the discussion is missing some key literature. Figures, tables and other visual tools are used in a clear way to help to define and describe concepts and ideas. There is an excellent attempt to analyse and evaluate the main components of the system at a fairly advanced level. The discussion of results is rich, insightful and meaningful. The evaluation engages in rich, meaningful discussion with critical evaluation a cornerstone of the work. The conclusion discusses in rich detail the successes, failures and oversights of the project, with sensible suggestions for solving some of the challenging elements of the project.

The work is of exceptional quality, covering all of the key criteria specified in the learning objectives for the module and evidencing academic strength and rigour that is above the level of study. This reads as a process of discovery which is a really nice narrative. This is a brilliant technical piece of work. You have evidenced clear understanding about some of the shortcomings of the project throughout the report, though it would have been nice to read chapters around discussion/evaluation/conclusion that were dedicated to those particular aspects. This is really well written! The only thing missing from this is more iterative/reflective user feedback and possibly some improvements through the report in terms of clarity of expression (e.g. 'Reading some documents on...')

Jump to...