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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Student: Joe** | **Marker:** Michael Meredith | **Agreed Mark: 55%** |
| **Turnitin Similarity Index: 16% (checked and OK)** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Criteria** | **Comments** | **Mark**  **(out of 100%)** | | |
| Carrying out an in-depth investigation of the context and literature and, where  appropriate, other similar products.  **(10%)** | You did a good job a finding those similar products with some useful insight that lends itself to your project – I would be careful about drawing the performance conclusions you did without knowing the state of optimisation or hardware it was running through. | 65 | 0.1 | 6.5 |
| Identifying, selecting and applying appropriate tools, techniques and approaches relevant to the project.  **(20%)** | Another solid section here… I did feel that I was sometimes missing the key user requirements before tool selections were made, but you did round up some alternatives and justify which you were going to use | 62 | 0.2 | 12.4 |
| Producing a set of deliverables by which the success of the piece of work can be judged.  Marking should address the following:   * Does the deliverable meet the aims of the project and the target audience? * Were suitable and relevant engineering approaches/processes used? * Has the success of the project been measured? * What is the quality of the deliverable and its video? * What is the difficulty of the deliverable? * How complete is the deliverable? * Is it well described in the documentation? * Was the demonstration of the work convincing?   **(50%)** | Reading over your development chapter, I do get the impression that you are trial-and-erroring your way through it in places. While not necessarily a bad thing, you did research on existing and similar techniques that should have guided your way a bit more here, along with perhaps deeper research into what might be achievable with certain algorithms. I take the point that sometimes you do need to just try stuff out and see what happens, but I feel you have made better use of educated guesses to direct you, and have that initial plan articulated.  The frame detection appears to work well | 50 | 0.5 | 25 |
| Research, critically reflect on and clearly communicate issues relevant to project success.  **(10%)** | I am glad that you have put a very positive perspective on what you have achieved, because what you have done is okay, but I think there are some obvious balances to throw in, such as how useful is the proof-of-concept in helping establish ball locations, what would the ideal platform be, how accurate is it, especially with manually needing to locate the table corners and what happens if the camera perspective slightly changes, and how can this actually be used to measure accuracy of balls being put back, etc. | 50 | 0.1 | 5 |
| Research, critically reflect on and clearly communicate issues relevant to professional and ethical concerns, risk, and aspects of personal development planning (PDP).  **(5%)** | You have pulled out some good areas of discussion here and reflected upon them well | 70 | 0.05 | 3.5 |
| Quality of report, referencing and video.  **(5%)** | The main comment I have about the report, is it needed to be kept in a more scientific tone, but that aside, it is well laid out and easy to read… you do however slip out of the third-person style in a few places, particularly in the latter stages of chapter 4. You also have a [source] citation in chapter 4.7. | 60 | 0.05 | 3 |
| **Mark: Project (Technical Computing)**  *To update the final mark, do Crtl-A and then F9.* | | **55%** | | |