

## **Business & Computing Examinations (BCE)**

# Suite 404 Albany House, 324-326 Regent Street LONDON W1B 3HH

Tel/Fax: 44 207 929 7275

#### WRITTEN EXAMINATION ASSESSMENT SHEET

#### Each question carries a total of 20 marks. Candidates answer all questions.

(5) Excellent (4) Good (3) Compete	nt (2) Poor	(	(1) F	Fail
Research and Analysis				
Understanding of sources	5 4	3	2	1
Contextualisation of sources	5 4	3	2	1
Detail/perception of responses to questions	5 4	3	2	1
Breadth of research	5 4	3	2	1
Focus on question	5 4	3	2	1
Organisation/structure	5 4	3	2	1
Understanding/insight into issues	5 4	3	2	1
Introduction	5 4	3	2	1
Conclusion	5 4	3	2	1
Presentation				
Written in fluent English	5 4	3	2	1
Correct use of grammar and syntax	5 4	3	2	1
Accurate spelling	5 4	3	2	

#### **Grade Criteria - Marking Scale**

Grade	Mark
Distinction	>= 80
Credit	>= 65
Pass	>=50
Fail	< 50

### **Computer Coursework Assessment Sheet**

1. Title, Abstract, Table of Contents, Introduction							
$\mathcal{C}$	nformative ormative	2 5	inaccu accura		3 6		
2. <b>Program do</b>	escription						
incomplete 1 comprehensive 4	inaccurate authoritative	2 5	no crit insight	ical thou ful	ught	3 6	
3. Analysis, investigation and requirements							
no argument 1 no foundation 2 careless, shallow 3 well argued 4 sound in principle 5 meticulous 6							
4. Actual Cod	ing						
ill-defined 1 incomplete 2 poor solution 3 well specified 4 well-executed 5 perfect program 6							
5. Program Testing							
no proper criteria appropriate criteria	1 entirely sul 4 objective to		2 5		assessn ed asses		3 6
6. Conclusion							
vague 1 clearly identified 4	unsubstantia justified	ated	2 5	narrow broad s		3 6	
7. Quality of presentation							
draft standard 1 good quality 4	lots of errors tidy, no erro		2 5	difficu well w	lt to rea	ad 3 6	

#### **Other Coursework Assessment Sheet**

1. <b>Title, A</b>					
vague 1 succinct 4	uninformative informative	e 2 5	inaccura accurate	te 3 6	
2. <b>Review</b> ,					
incomplete comprehensive	1 inaccura 4 authorit	ate 2 ative 5	no critica insightfu	al thought 3	
3. <b>Problem</b>	n analysis				
no argument well argued		dation 2 n principle 5		s, shallow 3 lous 6	
4. Researce	h and method	ls			
ill-defined well specified		executed 5	poor solu perfect p		
5. Results					
no proper criter appropriate crite		ely subjective ctive tests		iased assessment alanced assessment	3 6
6. Conclus	sion				
vague clearly identifie		estantiated ed		arrow view 3 road scope 6	
7. Quality					
draft standard good quality		f errors no errors		ifficult to read 3 well written 6	