**Student Name : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Supervisor Name : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Second Marker Name : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Marks | Comments | Supervisor  Mark | Second  Marker | Overall  Mark |
| **Research and Background Knowledge** The extent of the student’s background research, technology research, their knowledge and understanding of current work of the project area and quality of references | 25 | **Supervisor Comments**  **Second Marker Comments** |  |  |  |
| **Requirements Specification**  The extent to which the student has successfully specified the scope, identified detailed functionality, and confirmed the choice of technologies for their project. | 25 | **Supervisor Comments**  **Second Marker Comments** |  |  |  |
| **Feasibility**  The extent to which the student has investigated and validated the feasibility of the project in order to minimise risk and validate their approach. | 25 | **Supervisor Comments**  **Second Marker Comments** |  |  |  |
| **Planning of future work**  The extent of the student’s  ability to identify and plan the remaining work to be done. | 15 | **Supervisor Comments**  **Second Marker Comments** |  |  |  |
| **Technical writing**  Spelling, grammar, referencing, writing style, organisation of content. | 10 | **Supervisor Comments**  **Second Marker Comments** |  |  |  |
| **Totals** | **100%** |  |  |  |  |

\* The total mark here will count towards 10% of the project mark.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Categories and %Marks** | |
| **Research and Background Knowledge** - The extent of the student’s background research and primary research (if relevant) Their knowledge and understanding of current work of the project area and quality of references   * **20-25%:** Publishable standard research, background research equivalent to a research paper and deep critical understanding; peer reviewed credible references; * **15-19%:** Good coverage of background, references books, papers and webpages with a good *critical* understanding * **10-14%:** Some coverage of background, references either book or papers and webpages, limited critical understanding * **0-9%:** Poor coverage of background, references are webpages and papers, no critical understanding | **Requirements specification** - The extent to which the student has successfully specified the scope, identified detailed functionality, and confirmed the choice of technologies for their project. The complexity of the project should be taken into account in this section.   * **20-25%:** Complete and clearly defined scope of all deliverables of the project; Critical comparison of candidate technologies with clear criteria and reasons for final selection; Detailed functionality identified without ambiguity, using appropriate notations. * **15-19%:** Good identification of scope, with clear justification and selection of technologies; detailed functionality specified clearly. Some areas may need clarification. * **10-14%:**  Scope defined but lacks sufficient detail and completeness in some areas; Technologies selected, but lacking full credible criteria in the justification; detailed functionality specified but lacks completeness in parts. * **0-9%:** Scope insufficiently specified; Ambiguity in requirements and focus; detailed functionality incomplete; Lack of critical thinking or evaluation of alternative technologies or technology chosen. |
| **Feasibility** - The extent to which the student has investigated and validated the feasibility of the project in order to minimise risk and validate their approach. The complexity of the project should be taken into account in this section. The student’s ability to discuss the project feasibility/issues/solutions should also be taken into account.   * **20-25%:** Student has identified the critical issues on the project and validated pragmatic solutions; the effort of the student has validated the feasibility of the project. * **15-19%:** Student has identified all technical and functional issues, but has not completely validated the solutions in all cases. * **10-14%:** The student demonstrates that they have identified the majority of issues but has not identified solutions to all. Some issues not identified. * **0-9%:** The student has struggled to identify the issues on the project; solutions are not validated; | **Planning of future work** - Students ability to identify and plan the remaining work to be done.   * **11-15%:** The remaining work has been identified in detail – with clear identification of all phases of the work remaining, where each phase is clearly planned and explained. * **7-10%:** The remaining work has been identified, with some parts lacking full detail. * **4-6%:** Key phases and dates provided, but lack of detail. * **0-3%:** Insufficient detail to provide a clear pathway. |
| **Technical writing** - Spelling, grammar, referencing, writing style, organisation of content. The complexity of the project should be taken into account in this section.   * **8-10%:** Publishable standard of writing, equivalent to a research paper * **5-7%:** Good standard of writing, no major spelling or grammar errors, good citation * **3-4%:** Good standard of writing, a few spelling or grammar errors, poor citation * **0-2%:** Poor standard of writing, several spelling or grammar errors, poor citation |  |