School of Computer Science & Informatics
University of Liverpool

COMP390 CA3 Project Dissertation – Marking Guidance

Professionalism (10%)
Did you keep in regular contact with your supervisor? Were your emails written clearly with a professional tone? Did you turn up to project meetings on time, or did you give sufficient notice if you needed to cancel? Did you have a clear agenda for each meeting and a target for the next meeting? Did you show good time management across both semesters when planning your meetings and overall project deliverables? Note that the second marker will not have detailed knowledge of some of these aspects, so they will discuss these with your supervisor during the marking process.

Artifact (50%)
Does your project deliver on what it set out to do? If not, have you given a good justification for this in the dissertation? Does it meet all the aims and requirements? Is it technically correct? Does it run without visible bugs and errors? Did you demonstrate competency in using the tools and technologies related to your project? Have you shown a clear understanding of the implementation language and development environment? If it has a user interface, does it meet the end users' needs? Does the navigation and operation of the UI/UX meet expected norms for the software domain? If you had any issues completing the development of the software, are these clearly articulated? Note that the markers will look at the entire dissertation to determine how well the artifact and its implementation are described. They will base their mark on text explanations, screenshots of the software in use, and knowledge of what they saw in the video.

Dissertation (40%)
These criteria follow the same structure (and headings) as the dissertation itself, so check that you have included each heading and written something for each one. The markers will be looking for a coherent story of your project, from start to finish, with later sections building on the things you introduced in the earlier parts.

Introduction & Background
Does your introduction explain things clearly and succinctly for a general audience? Could someone with no knowledge of your project read this and feel confident that they know what your project is all about? Have you cited appropriate sources to justify what you did and why you did it? Have you included any key (or seminal) references that would be expected for your project topic? Have you explained any background knowledge that the reader needs so they can understand the rest of the dissertation?

Requirements Analysis
If you interviewed or surveyed other people to come up with your list of requirements, have you included the questions you asked them, and explained how the analysis took place? Does your statement of ethical compliance use the correct participant category for requirements analysis? Have you given your participant consent forms to your supervisor for safekeeping?

Design
Does your design show all the components of your system and how they are organised? Have you included suitable diagrams using an acceptable notation? Have you clearly described the data structures and algorithms you used? Have you included the design of the UI, with annotated screenshots showing the flow of navigation?

Implementation
Have you described how the implementation progressed as you worked on the software, including any dead ends and things that didn't work? Have you explained how you solved any coding problems? Did you include code snippets and accompanying text to show key parts of the system and how they work? Does this section tell the story of your project development in a coherent way?

Testing & Evaluation
Have you shown how you tested and evaluated the software? Did you include results in an easy-to-read format (such as a table) with accompanying explanations and discussion? If you asked other people to test your software, have you explained what you asked them to do, and what they said? Have you considered the anonymity and ethics of using human testers? Does your statement of ethical compliance use the correct participant category for evaluation? Have you given your participant consent forms to your supervisor for safekeeping?

Project Ethics
Have you included the statement of ethical compliance? Does it use the correct data and participant categories? Did you clearly state that you have read and followed the ethical guidance for projects? Have you covered the ethical aspects of using external data (if applicable) and human participants for evaluation (if you did)? If your project has other obvious ethical aspects, have you described these clearly and shown how you addressed them?

Conclusion & Future Work
Does your conclusion wrap up the dissertation clearly? Does it summarise what you did and how successful you were? Does it refer back to key points from the introduction, your project requirements, and other relevant sections of the dissertation? Have you presented your project experience in a positive way, even if it didn't fully go to plan? Have you thought about the wider context of your project and shown how you might approach it differently or expand it with more time?

BCS Project Criteria & Self-Reflection
Have you listed each criterion as a bullet point and written a brief sentence or two for each one, showing how your project met that requirement? Have you tied each criterion to earlier parts of the dissertation? Have you written at least a couple of paragraphs to reflect on your own learning process? Have you considered your strengths and weaknesses? Have you summarised the positive things you gained from the project? Did you mention things that went well, and things that didn't go so well?

References & Citations
Have you followed the accepted format for citations (Harvard or IEEE)? Do citations actually appear in the body of your work, with an associated reference at the end? Is the number of references appropriate for the type of project you are doing?

Appendices
Are appendices (if any) used correctly to present only extra, non-essential material? Does the main body of the dissertation still make sense and contain sufficient detail without needing to read the appendices? Is the overall balance between main body and appendices appropriate for the material presented?

Overall Structure & Organisation
Is the dissertation well-written, with correct spelling and grammar? Does it look like a formal piece of academic writing? Is the content spread across the sections in an accessible, understandable, and succinct manner, without repetition?