

CMP040X301Y BSc Project Independent Marking Criteria				
Student Name		Tyler Supersad		
Student ID		SUP20486969		
Project Title		Deepfake Detective From Model Development to Web Application Integration		
Programme		BSc Computer Science		
Supervisor		Dr Charles Clarke		
Criteria: Self-manage a significant piece of individual work using appropriate project management techniques.				
Criteria: Self-manage a significant piece of individual work using appropriate project management techniques.	1	EXCELLENT: Attended all meetings with supervisor in a well-prepared manner, and gradually took the lead in the meeting.	SATISFACTORY: Attended most meetings with the supervisor in a well-prepared manner, occasionally took the lead in the meeting.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Attendance and preparedness for meetings was poor, strongly lead by the supervisor throughout.
	2	EXCELLENT: Kept and evidenced high quality documentation including a log of all supervisory meetings and their agreed outcomes.	SATISFACTORY: Kept and evidenced documentation and log of most supervisory meetings and their agreed outcomes.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little evidence documentation and log of supervisory meetings and agreed outcomes.
	3	EXCELLENT: Developed a high-quality plan of work from the outset and self-monitored progress, adapting and planning to suit changes in scope and requirements.	SATISFACTORY: Developed a plan of work and generally monitored progress throughout the progress, updating the plan as required.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Only a minimal plan developed and rarely updated to meet changing scope and requirements.
	4	EXCELLENT: Showed clear initiative and organisational independence in the management of the project.	SATISFACTORY: Occasionally showed initiative and organisational independence in the management of the project.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Rarely showed initiative and organisational independence in the management of the project.
	5	EXCELLENT: Clearly demonstrated the ability to respond to advice regarding the organisation of the project.	SATISFACTORY: Would often demonstrate the ability to respond to advice regarding the organisation of the project.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Would rarely respond to advice regarding the organisation of the project.
Criteria: Synthesise information, ideas, and practices to define a quality solution to a problem.				
Criteria: Synthesise information, ideas, and practices to define a quality solution to a problem.	6	EXCELLENT: Undertook a very demanding problem given previous experience and domain of study.	SATISFACTORY: Undertook a reasonably demanding given previous experience and domain of study.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Problem undertaken was not very demanding given previous experience and domain of study.
	7	EXCELLENT: Problem defined is focused and clearly understood.	SATISFACTORY: Problem could be better defined and is not completely understood.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Problem is not well defined and is not well understood.
	8	EXCELLENT: High-quality investigation has been undertaken and evidenced into the problem context.	SATISFACTORY: Good investigation has been undertaken with suitable evidence into the problem context.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Minimal investigation undertaken with little evidence into the problem context.
	9	EXCELLENT: Clear evidence of reading and investigation around the problem area, such as other products and other methodologies.	SATISFACTORY: Some evidence of reading and investigating around the problem area, maybe including alternative products and methodologies.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little evidence of reading and investigating around the problem area, with little consideration of alternative products/methods.
	10	EXCELLENT: An excellent range of literature and/or technology has been reviewed.	SATISFACTORY: A good range of literature and/or technology has been reviewed.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little literature and/or technology has been reviewed.
	11	EXCELLENT: Excellent critical appraisal of the literature and/or technology reviewed.	SATISFACTORY: Good critical appraisal of the literature and/or technology reviewed.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little critical appraisal of the literature and/or technology reviewed.
	12	EXCELLENT: Clear evidence of an understanding of the underlying principles behind the problem.	SATISFACTORY: Some evidence of some understanding of the underlying principles behind the problem.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little evidence of an understanding of the underlying principles behind the problem.
	13	EXCELLENT: The investigation clearly informs the actual work undertaken within the project to solve the problem.	SATISFACTORY: The investigation somewhat informs the actual work undertaken within the project to solve the problem.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little evidence that the investigation was used to inform the work undertaken to solve the problem.
Criteria: Apply practical and analytical skills present in computer science as a whole.				
Criteria: Apply practical and analytical skills present in computer science as a whole.	14	EXCELLENT: The product delivered involved creation and/or mastery of something new to the student.	SATISFACTORY: The product delivered involved creation and/or mastery of some new ideas to the student.	NOT SATISFACTORY: The product delivered could be achieved without extending taught techniques/knowledge.
	15	EXCELLENT: Clear evidence of the outcomes and deliverables being evaluated against the initial project aims and work of others.	SATISFACTORY: Some evidence of the outcomes and deliverables being evaluated against the initial project aims and work of others.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little evidence of the outcomes and deliverables being evaluated against the initial project aims and work of others.
	16	EXCELLENT: Clear evidence of having assessed alternative approaches to solving problems and making sound decisions on how to proceed.	SATISFACTORY: Some evidence of having assessed alternative approaches to solving problems and making generally reasonable decisions on how to proceed.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little to no evidence of having assessed alternative approaches to solving problems.
	17	EXCELLENT: Clear evidence of ability to benefit from technical advice and choosing to backtrack to produce a better solution.	SATISFACTORY: Some evidence of ability to benefit from technical advice and maybe choosing to backtrack to produce a better solution.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little to no evidence of ability to benefit from technical advice and choosing to backtrack to produce a better-quality solution.
	18	EXCELLENT: Clear evidence of self-reliance and resourcefulness in solving technical problems demonstrated by seeking of technical information, understanding, then applying it.	SATISFACTORY: Some evidence of self-reliance and resourcefulness in solving technical problems demonstrated by seeking of technical information, understanding it, and then generally applying it.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little evidence of self-reliance and resourcefulness in solving technical problems with little to no demonstration of seeking technical information, understanding it, and applying it.
Criteria: Produce a project deliverable that meets a real need in a wider context.				
Criteria: Produce a project deliverable that meets a real need in a wider context.	19	EXCELLENT: Product delivered is of professional quality.	SATISFACTORY: Product delivered is of a somewhat professional quality.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Product delivered is not of a professional quality.
	20	EXCELLENT: Product has successfully met the original aims of the project.	SATISFACTORY: Product has successfully met most of the original aims of the project.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Product has only successfully met a few or none of the original aims of the project.
	21	EXCELLENT: The product developed is of significant scope and complexity given the degree of study.	SATISFACTORY: The product developed is of a satisfactory scope and complexity given the degree of study.	NOT SATISFACTORY: The product developed is of an unsatisfactory scope and complexity given the degree of study.
	22	EXCELLENT: The internal elegance/engineering/quality of the product delivered is high.	SATISFACTORY: The internal elegance/engineering/quality of the product delivered is satisfactory.	NOT SATISFACTORY: The internal elegance/engineering/quality of the product delivered is not satisfactory.
Criteria: Critical self-evaluation of the overall project process and deliverables.				
Criteria: Critical self-evaluation of the overall project process and deliverables.	23	EXCELLENT: Clear reflection on the project process, demonstrating achievements in overcoming issues faced during the project lifetime.	SATISFACTORY: Some reflection on the project process, with some demonstration of achievements in overcoming issues faced during the project lifetime.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little evidence of reflection on the project process, with little to no evidence of achievements in overcoming issues faced during the project lifetime.
	24	EXCELLENT: Clear evidence of what would have been done differently with hindsight.	SATISFACTORY: Some evidence of what would have been done differently with hindsight.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little evidence of what would have been done differently with hindsight.

	25	EXCELLENT: Clear description of relevant future work which could be undertaken with the project.	SATISFACTORY: some relevant future work directions of the project described.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little to no future work directions described.
Recognise the legal, social, ethical, and professional issues relevant to a project.				
Recognise the legal, social, ethical, and professional issues relevant to a project.	26	EXCELLENT: Clear evidence of understanding of any legal issues related to the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report.	SATISFACTORY: Some evidence of understanding of any legal issues related to the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little to no evidence of understanding of any legal issues related to the project.
	27	EXCELLENT: Clear evidence of understanding of any social issues related to the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report.	SATISFACTORY: Some evidence of understanding of any social issues related to the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little to no evidence of understanding of any social issues related to the project.
	28	EXCELLENT: Clear evidence of understanding of any ethical issues related to the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report and suitable ethical clearance being sought and granted.	SATISFACTORY: Some evidence of understanding of any ethical issues related to the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report and suitable ethical clearance being sought and granted.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little to no evidence of understanding of any ethical issues related to the project.
	29	EXCELLENT: Clear evidence of understanding of the professional aspects of the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report.	SATISFACTORY: Some evidence of understanding of the professional aspects of the project as demonstrated by statements made in the project report.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little to no evidence of understanding of any professional issues related to the project.
Produce a report that describes and summarises the entire project deliverable and process, including evaluation.				
Produce a report that describes and summarises the entire project deliverable and process, including evaluation.	30	EXCELLENT: Report conforms to standards regarding the quality and format of presentation, including correct usage of project report template.	SATISFACTORY: Report mostly conforms to standards regarding the quality and format of presentation, and generally uses the project report template.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Report poorly conforms to standards regarding quality and format of presentation, and generally does not use project report template.
	31	EXCELLENT: Excellent quality of written expression, clearly conveying the work done using appropriate technical language.	SATISFACTORY: Good quality of written expression, and generally conveys the work done using appropriate technical language.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Poor quality of written expression and doesn't really convey the work done in suitably technical language.
	32	EXCELLENT: Fully appreciates the academic context of the work undertaken as evidenced by the scope and depth of the literature review.	SATISFACTORY: Appreciates the academic context of the work undertaken as evidenced by the reasonable scope and depth of the literature review.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little appreciation for the academic context of the work undertaken demonstrated by the limited scope and depth of the literature review.
	33	EXCELLENT: Demonstrated clear independence and resourcefulness in the conduct of the academic production of the work.	SATISFACTORY: Demonstrated general independence and resourcefulness in the conduct of the academic production of the work.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little demonstration of independence and resourcefulness in the conduct of the academic production of the work.
	34	EXCELLENT: Clearly demonstrates analytical thought as demonstrated by high-quality argumentation, weighing of evidence, succinct summarisation, enlightened commentaries, and the making of novel connections.	SATISFACTORY: Demonstrates some analytical thought as demonstrated either through argumentation, weighing of evidence, summarisation, commentary, or the making of novel connections.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little demonstration of analytical thought with little to no evidence of argumentation, weighing of evidence, summarisation, commentary, or the making of novel connections.
	35	EXCELLENT: High-quality self-appraisal as evidenced in the summing up, comparing achievements to aims, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the work, comparison to the state-of-the-art, and areas of future work.	SATISFACTORY: Good self-appraisal with evidence of summing up, comparing achievement to aims, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the work, comparison to the state-of-the-art, or defining areas of future work.	NOT SATISFACTORY: Little self-appraisal with little to no evidence of summing up, comparing achievements to aims, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the work, comparison to the state-of-the-art, or areas of future work.
General Feedback				
Excellent knowledge and understanding of the subject, including the ability to critically apply said knowledge and understanding in context. Arguments/answers are clear, structured, and accurate. Exemplary attainment of learning outcomes. A high level of insight and critical evaluation of the material. A comprehensive and up-to-date account of relevant theoretical and empirical material at the forefront of the discipline. A thorough understanding and integration of material supporting a cogent argument. Excellent writing of a high academic standard.				
Individual Feedback and Opportunities for Improvements				
Criteria: Self-manage a significant piece of individual work using appropriate project management techniques.	CRITERIA: Self-manage a significant piece of individual work using appropriate project management techniques.			
	1	There is very good evidence of regular supervisor meetings, preparation, independence, and personal ownership of the project.		
	2	There is very good evidence of high-quality project management documentation and supervision.		
	3	There is very good evidence of a high-quality plan of work, self-monitored progress, adapting and planning.		
	4	There is very good evidence of initiative and organisational independence in the management of the project.		
	5	There is very good evidence demonstrating the ability to respond to advice regarding the organisation of the project.		
CRITERIA: Synthesise information, ideas, and practices to define a quality solution to a problem.				
CRITERIA: Synthesise information, ideas, and practices to define a quality solution to a problem.	6	There is very good evidence that the chosen problem domain is very demanding, given previous experience.		
	7	There is very good evidence that clearly indicates that the problem is clearly defined and understood.		
	8	There is very good evidence to show that a high-quality investigation has been undertaken into the context of the problem.		
	9	There is very good evidence of reading and investigation around the problem area, such as other products and other methodologies.		
	10	There is very good evidence that an excellent range of literature and/or technology has been reviewed.		
	11	There is very good evidence of an excellent critical appraisal of the literature and/or technology reviewed.		

	12	There is very good evidence of an understanding of the underlying principles behind the problem.
	13	There is very good evidence to show that the investigation clearly informs the actual work undertaken within the project to solve the problem.
CRITERIA: Apply practical and analytical skills present in computer science as a whole.		
CRITERIA: Apply practical and analytical skills present in computer science as a whole.	14	There is very good evidence to show that the product delivered, involved creation and/or mastery of something new
	15	There is very good evidence to show that the outcomes and deliverables have been evaluated against the initial project aims, and work of others.
	16	There is very good evidence of having assessed alternative approaches to solving problems, and making sound decisions on how to proceed.
	17	There is very good evidence of having the ability to benefit from technical advice and choosing to backtrack to produce a better solution.
	18	There is very good evidence of self-reliance and resourcefulness in solving technical problems by sourcing technical information/advice, understanding it, then applying it.
Criteria: Produce a project deliverable that meets a real need in a wider context.		
Criteria: Produce a project deliverable that meets a real need in a wider context.	19	The technical artefact is of a professional quality.
	20	There is very good evidence to show how the technical artefact has met the original aims and objectives.
	21	There is very good evidence to show that the scope and complexity of the technical artefact is significant, given the degree of study.
	22	There is very good evidence to show that the internal elegance/engineering/quality of the product delivered is high.
Criteria: Critical self-evaluation of the overall project process and deliverables.		
Criteria: Critical self-evaluation of the overall project process and deliverables.	23	Improve the reflection on the project process. For example, by including comments on notable challenges and how they were addressed, time management, organisation, the initial project plan, technical issues, etc.
	24	Clear evidence of what would have been done differently with hindsight, has been stated.
	25	A clear description of relevant future work which could be undertaken with the project has been stated.
CRITERIA: Recognise the legal, social, ethical, and professional issues relevant to a project.		
CRITERIA: Recognise the legal, social, ethical, and professional issues relevant to a project.	26	There is very good evidence that demonstrates an understanding and consideration of appropriate legal issues that relate to the project.
	27	There is very good evidence that demonstrates an understanding and consideration of appropriate social issues that relate to the project.
	28	There is very good evidence that demonstrates an understanding and consideration of appropriate ethical issues that relate to the project.
	29	Include, or significantly enhance evidence that demonstrates an understanding and consideration of appropriate professional issues that relate to the project.
CRITERIA: Produce a report that describes and summarises the entire project deliverable and process, including evaluation.		
CRITERIA: Produce a report that describes and summarises the entire project deliverable and process, including evaluation.	30	The report conforms to standards regarding the quality and format of presentation, including correct usage of the project report template.
	31	The report evidences excellent quality of written expression, clearly conveying the work done using appropriate technical language.
	32	The scope and depth of the literature review, demonstrates an appreciation of the academic context of the work that has been undertaken.
	33	Independence and resourcefulness in the conduct of the academic production of the work, has been clearly evidenced.
	34	There is very good evidence to demonstrate analytical thought, high-quality argumentation, weighing of evidence, succinct summarisation, enlightened commentaries, and the making of novel connections.
	35	There is very good evidence to demonstrate high-quality self-appraisal in the summing up, comparing achievements to aims, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the work, comparison to the state-of-the-art, and areas of future work.
Grade	75	
Assessor Name	Dr Charles Clarke	
Role	Supervisor	
Date completed (e.g., 21st May 2023)	28th May 2023	