

Assessment Information/Brief 2025-26



University of
Salford
MANCHESTER

Module title	Advanced Web Development
CRN	31802
Level	6
Assessment title	Assignment 1 – Web Development with Frameworks
Weighting within module	This assessment is worth 50% of the overall module mark.
Submission deadline date and time	Project and report deadline: Friday 28th November 2025 16:00 Project demo: Individual time slots to be confirmed.
Module Leader/Assessment set by	Stefan Pletschacher s.pletschacher@salford.ac.uk
How to submit	Your assignment must be submitted through Blackboard in the form of a single ZIP file containing the complete project folder of your application and the report. The file should be named as: [Your surname]_[Your name.zip] — for example: Smith_John.zip. Following submission, you are required to demonstrate your work to the assessor. Individual time slots will be arranged. Projects that are not demonstrated will receive a mark of 0.

Assessment task details and instructions

This assignment consists of **two** parts.

Part 1 – Symfony Project (70%):

You are required to create a **website for reviewing music albums** using the **Symfony** PHP framework and related bundles. The information about albums, users and other entities must be stored in a relational database and interacted with through Doctrine ORM. The application structure should follow the recommended project structure from Symfony including, but not limited to, Twig templates, Bundles and MVC architecture.

Criteria

Marks will be awarded for:

- a) Quality of overall application design
- b) Quality of code written
- c) Use of Symfony components and external bundles

Your mark will reflect **what** you have done (implemented requirements/features) and **how** you did it (correct use of the framework, style and best practice).

Core Requirements

Your web application should allow users to register, log in/out, list, create, view, edit and delete album reviews. The review information should include artist, title, genre, track list as well as the reviewer and the actual review text. Non-authenticated users should not be able to write/edit/delete reviews but should be able to view them.

Intermediate Requirements

The application should allow multiple users to review a single album. Thus, meaning a user should be able to add an album if it does not exist, and subsequently other people should be able to write reviews about the album that has been created.

Advanced Requirements

The application should be well-structured, demonstrating a clear understanding of Symfony framework/components and application design including decoupling of functionality. In addition, extra features as users would expect from a real-world system should be implemented – such as (but not limited to):

- Multiple role levels (e.g. user, moderator and administrator)
- Advanced search functionality (such as faceted search)
- Advanced review rating system
- Image upload (album covers, user profile pictures etc.)

Part 2 – Framework Report (30%):

Research a Web Development Framework of your choice and discuss how this framework could either complement or replace Symfony for your web application as specified in Part 1. When deciding on which framework to select make sure that you can find enough information and resources to base your analysis on. Your findings are to be presented in a written report which should not exceed 2000 words. The following points should be covered, specifically in relation to the project at hand (Part 1):

- Overview of the framework
- Key features that correspond and/or differ in comparison with Symfony
- Advantages/disadvantages of the framework
- Discussion of how the framework could be used specifically in the web application as specified in Part 1
- Conclusions
- References

The use of AI tools is not permitted for this task! No marks will be awarded for generic text passages that do not directly relate to the project at hand.

Assessed intended learning outcomes

On successful completion of this assessment, you will be able to:

Knowledge and Understanding.

1. Use design patterns to create scalable and maintainable web applications;
2. Discuss the use of web frameworks and how they aid developers.

Transferable/Key Skills and other Attributes.

1. Create an application with a framework.

Module Aims

1. To give students insight into advanced issues and techniques relevant to the creation of large-scale web applications
2. To make effective use of professional frameworks and working practices
3. To create and document APIs to address real-world tasks
4. To see the user perspective by consuming your own API

Word count/ duration (if applicable)

Report: 2000 words

Feedback arrangements

Feedback on your project will be given following your presentation/demonstration. There you will also have the opportunity to ask any questions you might have.

Support arrangements

General support and advice will be given during the regular workshops. Please note that debugging of individual projects is not possible as this assignment has to be your own work.

Documents and Recommended Reading

- Lecture notes on blackboard (<https://blackboard.salford.ac.uk>)
- Symfony Documentation (<https://symfony.com/doc/>)
- Doctrine ORM Documentation (<http://docs.doctrine-project.org/projects/doctrine-orm/en/latest/>)
- Twig Documentation (<https://twig.symfony.com/doc/>)

askUS

The University offers a range of support services for students through [askUS](#).

Good Academic Conduct and Academic Misconduct

Students are expected to learn and demonstrate skills associated with good academic conduct (academic integrity). Good academic conduct includes the use of clear and correct referencing of source materials. Here are links to where you can find out more about the skills which students require:

<http://www.salford.ac.uk/skills-for-learning>
[Academic integrity & referencing](#)
[Referencing](#)

Academic Misconduct is an action which may give you an unfair advantage in your academic work. This includes plagiarism, asking someone else to write your assessment for you or taking notes into an exam. The University takes all forms of academic misconduct seriously.

Assessment Information

If you have any questions about assessment rules, you can find out more [here](#).

Personal Mitigating Circumstances

If personal mitigating circumstances may have affected your ability to complete this assessment, you can find more information about personal mitigating circumstances procedure [here](#).

Personal Tutor/Student Progression Administrator

If you have any concerns about your studies, contact your Personal Tutor or your Student Progression Administrator.

Assessment Criteria

This is an individual project and all submitted work has to be your own. The use of generative AI for any parts of the assignment is not permitted. The assignment must be completed on time and standard university lateness penalties will apply.

It is your responsibility to ensure that your submitted project can load, run and be demonstrated – it is strongly recommended that you test this prior to submitting the zip file containing your work. **Marks in the 40% and above brackets are only awarded for working features** (i.e. those that can be demonstrated – not for code stumps, misconfigured projects etc.). **No marks will be awarded for code/features that the student cannot explain during the demo. Projects that are not demonstrated will receive a mark of 0.**

Symfony Project (70 %)

The following criteria will be used to award marks to the application:

Mark	Requirements
0 - 9%	An empty and/or entirely non-functioning project / project not demonstrated.
10 - 19%	An application skeleton with controllers and templates related to the core requirements including correct routing but major errors when accessed via browser.
20 - 29%	The application has severely limited functionality. The student may have used Symfony in an incorrect manner demonstrating they have little understanding of the Framework or web application development.
30 - 39%	The application has some functionality but is missing one or two key aspects of the pass mark (e.g. unable to log in, unable to edit a review).
40 - 49%	The student has implemented the core functionality requirements including: the ability for a user to register, log in/out and the functionality to list, write, view, edit and delete simple reviews. Unauthenticated users cannot create/edit/delete reviews.
50 - 59%	The application covers all core and intermediate requirements. The code should be well organised and contain appropriately named controllers, form types and entities.
60 - 69%	Users should be able to do everything from the previous sections plus an added feature of the advanced requirements to demonstrate that the student has further researched Symfony capabilities beyond the workshops. All features have been implemented to a good standard, following a clear application logic and with usability appropriately considered.
70 - 79%	The project shows a deep understanding of the Symfony framework with decoupled/reusable design throughout and with multiple additional functionalities from the advanced requirements. Code is free of errors, has no unhandled exceptions, follows all relevant coding conventions with very good readability and use of comments.
80 - 89%	Reusable functionality is implemented in and linked as an external bundle.
90 - 100%	The web application is exceptionally well presented and implemented to a professional standard, respecting all relevant design principles and best practice, ready to be released in a production environment.

Framework Report (30 %)

The following criteria are used to mark the report in relation to the requirements as described above (Assessment task details and instructions).

Performance Descriptors

Extremely poor (0-9).

Totally inadequate demonstration of required knowledge.

Not able to apply the practical and analytical skills from their programmes.

Little academic value; presentation is extremely poor; work has no structure or clarity; extremely poor use of language; no references; no attempt to provide evidence of sources used.

Very Poor (10-19).

Virtually no relevant knowledge demonstrated.

Fails to adequately apply the practical and analytical skills from their programme.

Academic arguments presented are inappropriate or very poorly linked; presentation is very poor; work has little discernible structure or clarity; very poor use of language; lack of ability to source adequate material; very poor referencing.

Poor (20-29).

Inconsistent or inaccurate knowledge.

Limited and inappropriate and inaccurate application of the practical and analytical skills from their programme.

Identifies issues for reflection but lacks evidence of reflective processes.

Confusion or weakness in academic argument; presentation is poor; work is disorganised and lacks clarity; poor use of language; poor use of reference material; inappropriate or outdated sources with numerous referencing errors.

Unsatisfactory (30-39).

Limited evidence of knowledge.

Inappropriate application of the practical and analytical skills from their programme.

Mainly descriptive evidence of analysis, inconsistent critical approach, little evaluation or synthesis.

Follows processes of reflection but fails to demonstrate insight; lacks coherence in the self-management of a significant piece of work.

Presentation is unsatisfactory; work is limited in terms of structure, coherence or clarity; limitations in academic style; unsatisfactory referencing with errors; limited ability to support content with relevant sources.

Adequate (40-49).

Basic knowledge with occasional inaccuracies.

Appropriate yet basic application of the practical and analytical skills from their programme.

Critical analysis evident, with some evaluation and synthesis, although limited evidence of reflection.

Some appropriate academic argument although not well applied and lacking in clarity; presentation of work is adequate in terms of structure, coherence, clarity and academic style; some inconsistencies; some grammar and syntax errors which detract from the content; narrow range of sources; referencing in presented work is adequate with some inconsistencies or inaccuracies; over utilises secondary sources; references used are partly outdated.

Fair (50-59).

Mostly accurate knowledge with satisfactory depth and breadth of knowledge.

Solid application of the practical and analytical skills from their programme

Sound critical analysis and evaluation or synthesis.

Demonstrates basic ability to synthesise information in order to formulate appropriate questions and conclusions; reflective process is utilised, with insight demonstrating planning for future practice.

Relevant academic argument; presentation of work is fair in terms of structure coherence, clarity and academic style; some inconsistencies in grammar and syntax; fair range of sources identified with appropriate referencing and few inaccuracies; appropriate use of primary and secondary sources.

Good (60-69).

Consistently relevant accurate knowledge with good depth and breadth.

Clear and relevant application of the practical and analytical skills from their programme.

Clear, in depth critical analysis, evaluation and academic argument with synthesis of different ideas and perspectives.

Presentation of work is well organised with good use of language to express ideas or argument; very few inconsistencies in grammar and syntax good; good range of sources; well referenced with very few inaccuracies; good use of primary and secondary sources.

Very Good (70-79).

Comprehensive knowledge demonstrating very good depth and breadth.

Clear insight into links between the practical and analytical skills from their programme.

Very good analysis and synthesis of material with evidence of critical and independent thought.

Demonstrates ability to transfer knowledge between different contexts appropriately; balanced and mature approach to reflection used to enhance practice and performance.

Presentation is of a very good standard, demonstrating a scholarly style. Very good grammar and syntax. Clear evidence of referencing to a wide range of primary and secondary sources which are used effectively in supporting the work.

Excellent (80-89).

Excellent depth of knowledge in a variety of contexts.

Coherent and systematic application of the practical and analytical skills from their programme.

Excellent critical analysis and synthesis.

Integrates the complexity of a range of knowledge and excellent understanding of its relevance.

Arguments handled skilfully with imaginative interpretation of material; presentation is excellent, well-structured and logical; demonstrates a scholarly style; excellent grammar and syntax.

Outstanding (90-100).

Outstanding knowledge.

Exceptional application of the practical and analytical skills from their programme.

Outstanding critical analysis and synthesis.

Excels in self-managing a significant piece of work and critical self-evaluation of the process show an aptitude to formulate new questions, ideas or challenges.

Incorporates evidence of original thinking; presentation is outstanding demonstrating a fluent academic style.

In Year Retrieval Scheme

This assessment is not eligible for in year retrieval.

Reassessment

If you fail your assessment, and are eligible for reassessment, you will be able to find the date for resubmission on your module site in Blackboard. There is no resubmission if you are on a retake attempt. For students with accepted personal mitigating circumstances, this will be your replacement assessment attempt.

The reassessment briefing will be made available via Blackboard in due course. It will be setting the same task.

We know that having to undergo a reassessment can be challenging however support is available. Have a look at all the sources of support outlined earlier in this brief.