

# MSc Computer Science Project Handbook

School of Engineering, Computing and Mathematical Sciences

Handbook Author: Dr Adam Grant Worrallo

## 1. Introduction

This handbook is intended for use by students and staff involved in level 7 projects. It should contain all the information needed for the Online Masters Dissertation module. If this is not the case, or if you find any typos, inaccuracies, or contradictions, then please contact the module author or facilitator (contact details on Canvas).

Level 7 Projects are opportunities for a student to study a topic in the relevant field and develop their research, report writing and presentation skills. These projects can also include the development of artefact, providing students with the opportunity to develop their practical skills.

The projects will be supervised by a member of academic staff, who will also serve as first assessor for the project. A reader will be allocated to the project as the second assessor. The projects will run over two module blocks for a total of sixteen weeks. The project supervisor will communicate regularly with their project students to set tasks and discuss various aspects of the work.

Module Assessment will be based on the report submitted at the end of the module, an oral/poster presentation provided as a pre-recorded video, and Viva session with your supervisory team.

One aim of project work is that students should enjoy an opportunity to study independently and hence should be allowed a certain amount of leeway how they do the project. This is best done by agreement between students and supervisors and so although these notes contain certain rules, it is important that both parties feel able to negotiate between themselves an appropriate course of action in most instances. A key aim is that students should be given the opportunity to show their strengths. Students should realise that this project module is very different from any previous module taken by them as it will require their independent work on open-ended questions, where there might be no definitive answer or solution.

## 2. Allocation of Projects and Supervisor

Students will be automatically assigned a project supervisor and reader, with instructions to contact the allocated supervisor and commence the dissertation journey during Week 1 of the module.

It is the responsibility of the project coordinator to ensure that each student has been allocated a supervisor by the end of Week 1 of the module. Students should be aware that it is very difficult to change supervisors once the module has started and this will be done in exceptional cases only, and only if the circumstances allow that. No changes of project supervisor are allowed after Week 3.

Once allocated a supervisor, it is your responsibility to contact your supervisor to discuss issues and report on your progress, and to ensure you understand what is required in terms of submission and assessment. You could contact your supervisor using a Teams Message or Email. You can also discuss communication with your supervisor to identify any preferences.

## 3. Supervisor Contact

You should have regular contact with your supervisor. Communication with your supervisor is likely to be frequent at the beginning, as you will probably need more guidance and support when you are preparing/refining the project plan and ethical approval documentation.

At the start of each week, you should contact your supervisor and give a brief account of your progress.

The progress update should address the following points:

- tasks undertaken since your last progress update.
- tasks you plan to work on before your next progress update.
- any issues you have encountered or are at risk of encountering.

Your supervisor will review your progress, planned works and reply in a timely manner. It is your responsibility to provide these weekly progress updates and engage in regular communication with your supervisor.

## 4. Submission of Project

The final report should be submitted **electronically via the module canvas page** by the submission deadline (see canvas assignment task). The electronic versions should be in Word, pdf, or some other common format. **Electronically scanned copies of a wholly handwritten report are not permitted.** Students must keep a copy of the report for their own records.

The submission will be checked for plagiarism using the standard University software. If any plagiarism is suspected, the standard University procedures on plagiarism will be followed. Information on what constitutes plagiarism can be found on the University website:

<https://www.wlv.ac.uk/current-students/conduct-and-appeals/academic-misconduct/>

If a student is unable to submit the work, for whatever reason, then they should contact their supervisor and project coordinator as soon as possible.

The final project report should include a summary (typically, in the introductory section) describing the scope of the work and the main results, indicating the main sources used. Pages and sections should be numbered for easy reference and the title page should contain student name, student number, module code and title, title of project, supervisor, and the date of submission. The report should include a contents page and a full reference list, indicating all the books, articles or websites used. Due to the variety of suitable project topics, there is no official word count. However, as a very rough guide you should keep your report to **between 40-80 pages** (excluding bibliography and appendices).

Recall that, in the text, if a results, piece of code etc., is taken from some source, there must be an indication of the source, and whether it has been significantly expanded or adapted. Apart from short statements, students should not copy directly from sources, and everything must be expressed in the student's own words, except where explicitly stated. Students whose work is too closely based on their sources will have marks deducted. Guidelines on **Harvard referencing** can be found on the University Learning Centre's webpage:

<http://www.wlv.ac.uk/lib/skills for learning/referencing.aspx>

<http://www.wlv.ac.uk/lib/skills for learning/referencing/harvard referencing.aspx>

## 5. Presentation / Viva Voce

Each student is required to provide a pre-recorded video presentation as part of the final submission. It should last about **15 minutes**. The focus of the presentation should be on communicating the main aspects of the project and demonstrate an understanding of the project. The presentation should be pitched at your fellow students, and it should be aimed at them as the audience.

During the marking period you will be invited to a meeting with your supervisor and reader during which questions will be asked to ascertain your understanding of the project and to ensure the project report is your own work.

If you fail to convince the examiners that the work is your own, you may fail the module and be asked to resit it. Usually, cases of academic misconduct are picked up before the viva/presentation, but sometimes it only becomes obvious once a student is asked questions!

There are three main aims of the presentation and questioning:

1. The presentation should cover the main aspects of the project, be well summarised, coherent and have a clear narrative.
2. Students should demonstrate that they understand and have mastered the material.
3. Ensure the project report is the students own work.

Students can make the presentation in any acceptable format, PowerPoint, Beamer, poster, even white board ("chalk and talk") etc. although this should be agreed with the supervisor. The video presentation should clearly show both the presentation and the student. There is no official or required application for recording the video presentation. You are welcome to use any application but should ensure the resulting video meets the requirements outlined. Some good options include MS Teams (via a meeting with only yourself as a participant) and Open Broadcaster Software (OBS).

Advice to students on presentations:

- The fifteen minutes allowed will pass by quicker than you think so plan carefully.
- Cover some part of the material in depth rather than all parts superficially.
- Give yourself enough time to demonstrate your artefact.
- A good example is worth a thousand words.
- Practise in front of friends and family, even those that have no understanding of the area. This will give you confidence and you will be less nervous. It also allows you to judge the timing.
- Imagine that the presentation is for a job interview or a pitch to a client.
- Does it look professional?

## 6. Post Assessment and Feedback

The supervisor is ultimately responsible for filling out the **Assessment and Feedback Form** (see appendix B). The feedback comments should be sent by the supervisor to each student after the presentation and questioning within a good time.

Assessors and supervisors should be aware that the assessment documentation written by them may be made available to the student and the external examiner. The project coordinator is responsible for ensuring that all marks are collected, moderated, and submitted before the relevant University deadlines. They are responsible for collecting the Assessment and Feedback Forms from the supervisors and ensuring that they are ready for the external examiners.

## 7. Responsibilities

### **Project Coordinator**

- I. Ensure that Canvas VLE sites have material relevant to the project module before it begins. To include:
  - a. This handbook.
  - b. Academic integrity/ethics forms.
  - c. Assessment and Feedback Form.
- II. Assigning of supervisors and readers to students by the end of Week 1 of the module.
- III. Check for problems in Week 4 by contacting students and supervisors.
- IV. Remind students and supervisors regarding deadlines via Canvas announcements.
- V. Ensure fairness and consistency in the assessment process. Moderate marks if necessary.
- VI. Prepare marks and projects for external examiner.

### **Supervisor**

- I. To discuss with students in Weeks 1-2 of module and set initial tasks.
- II. Provide regular communication with students for discussing progress and setting additional tasks. Provide advice and support within the limits of the allocated time.
- III. To report any concerns regarding student work (such as absences or low participation) to project coordinator.
- IV. To provide feedback to students on the quality of their work.
- V. To pass a copy of the final report to the reader.
- VI. To read the final reports in good time.
- VII. Complete the relevant sections of the Assessment and Feedback Form (see appendix B) before the questioning meeting. Finalize it after presentation and questioning.
- VIII. Organize individual Questioning session.
- IX. Send written feedback to student after questioning within good time.
- X. Return completed Assessment and Feedback Form (see appendix B) within a good time.

### **Reader**

- I. Liaise with supervisor.
- II. To read the final reports in good time.
- III. Complete the relevant sections of the Assessment and Feedback Form (see appendix B) before the questioning session.
- IV. Attend questioning session.
- V. Agree marks with supervisor.

### **Student**

- I. Provide regular progress updates to supervisor.
- II. To be aware of deadlines
- III. Submit work by deadlines.
- IV. Not plagiarize.
- V. Engage with Canvas regularly, i.e., course material, announcements, etc.
- VI. Register for the module in good time. Read and reply to e-mails (including in canvas).
- VII. Communicate any requirements for questioning session to supervisor at least one week before the questioning meeting.

## 8. Timeline

Time	Action
Week 1	Milestone 0 - Project Commencement & Supervisor Discussion
Week 2	Milestone 1 – Project Proposal
⋮	⋮
Week 4	Milestone 2 – Abstract & Introduction
⋮	⋮
Week 8	Milestone 3 – Literature Review
⋮	⋮
Week 10	Milestone 4 – Design
⋮	⋮
Week 12	Milestone 5 – Implementation
⋮	⋮
Week 14	Milestone 6 – Testing & Results, Experimentation & Results
⋮	⋮
Week 16	Milestone 7 – Final Adjustments and Submission

## 9. Assessment Guidelines

Each Final Year Project will be marked by two examiners, the supervisor and a second marker (reader). Also, we need to produce a short report for our external examiners on how this mark was arrived at using the MSc Project Assessment and Feedback Form (see appendix B).

### 9.1 - Restriction on Marks

The following is meant as a guidance to what constitutes a particular mark. Comments on the Assessment and Feedback Form (see appendix B) should refer to some of these criteria. The University operates a percentage-based scheme for MSc grades, with the pass mark beginning at 50%. (Please refer to the University Performance Descriptors for Level 7).

#### **Distinction, 70-100%**

- Extremely well organized and presented.
- Project could serve as a basis for a mini course at the appropriate level.
- Excellent choice of examples and logical flow.
- Good evidence of originality and independent thinking.
- Mastery of material

To achieve a Distinction, students do not need to have achieved mastery or excellence in all the above. Greater marks will be given for originality and evidence of independent thinking. Marks above 80% are only allowable if it is at a publishable standard and hence the work conducted is likely to be accepted in a peer-reviewed journal.

#### **Merit, 60-69%**

- Well organized and presented.
- Good choice of examples and logical flow.
- Some evidence of independent thinking. Follows standard texts and techniques sometimes.
- Sound understanding of material.

**Pass, 50-59%**

- Adequately organized and presented.
- Reasonable choice of examples and logical flow.
- Required a substantial amount of help from supervisor (relative to difficulty of topic).
- Little evidence of independent thinking. Tends to follow sources.
- Some good understanding of material.

**Fail, 0-49%**

- Poorly organized and presented.
- Poor choice of examples and logical flow.
- Required a significant amount of help from supervisor (relative to difficulty of topic).
- No evidence of independent thinking. Slavishly follows sources.
- Some understanding of material.

## 9.2 – Procedure for Marking a Project

**Awarding Marks:**

1. Each examiner will independently complete the appropriate sections of the Assessment and Feedback Form (see appendix B), assigning two marks, one for the written report and one for the presentation/viva. Both examiners need to attend the relevant presentations/viva.
2. If both supervisor and reader agree upon the overall marks the supervisor will record the marks in canvas.
3. If the overall marks awarded by supervisor and reader cannot be agreed and differ by more than 10% the supervisor will contact the project coordinator and they will third mark the project and confirm the mark.
4. All projects receiving marks above 80% and between 40-50% will be third marked by the project coordinator.

## Appendix A – Project Report Formatting Guidelines

The project report should be produced on A4 with a Left margin of 30mm, Right margin of 20mm, Top margin of 25mm and Bottom margin of 30mm.

No more than 1.5 line-spacing, using 12pt Times New Roman or Palatino.

The word count for the report is dependent on the type of project, a one that involves a large element of practical work can attract less words than one that focuses on analysis and design.

Page numbering should start with Chapter 1. Title page, acknowledgements and contents pages should not be numbered. Pages should be numbered consecutively through the main text including diagrams, etc. Page numbers should be shown centrally at the bottom of the page in the bottom margin. Pagination of appendices should be continuous but distinct from the main text, e.g., A1, A2, A3,..., B1, B2, B3,... There should be no chapters or headings at the bottom the page. New chapters should start on a new page.

Abbreviations must be used with restraint and explained where necessary the first time they occur in a document. Thereafter, the abbreviated name may be used as shown below, e.g.,

*“The University of Wolverhampton is one of many Universities in the United Kingdom (UK). The UK has approximately...”*

The text should be organised as a sequence of numbered chapters. Within each chapter the material should be broken down into sub-sections with their own sub-heading. A hierarchical system of numbering of chapters, sub-sections and paragraphs should be used. It is not advisable to extend past three levels of hierarchy e.g.

- 1.
- 1.4
- 1.4.2

Headings and titles should be printed in bold characters. Underlining/underscoring should not be used for headings and should be used in the rest of the body of the text with considerable restraint. The start of paragraphs should not be indented differently from the remainder of the paragraph.

Direct quotations from external sources should be indented inside both left and right margins. Quotation marks (“...” ) should be placed around them and the reference to the quotation given. Shorter quotations, say less than three lines, can be embedded in the text.

**At Masters Level referencing is taken seriously because you are expected to demonstrate to a high degree that your work is based on a full knowledge and evaluation of the work of others in the field.**

**You must use the Harvard Referencing style in your Dissertation.**

Tables and figures should be numbered separately but consecutively within chapters e.g., Table 3.1, Table 3.2, Figure 3.1, etc. You will be expected to use the appropriate software packages for preparing diagrams, tables, pictures, and other graphics.

Appendices should be started on separate sheets at the back of the report and preceded by a page blank except for the heading “Appendix A” one third of the way down the page.

Title Page - This should appear on a single unnumbered page.



## Appendix B – Assessment and Feedback Form

Both examiners (supervisor and reader) independently complete parts A, B and C of this sheet. Examiners should then meet to agree the final marks. Only the supervisor is required to complete parts D and E. Students should be given the final version of this form after marks have been agreed.

### Part A

**Name of Student:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Title of Project:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Supervisor:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Reader:** \_\_\_\_\_

### Part B: Assessment of Report

Please assign numeric values (out of 100) in the mark column. If the default weight is inappropriate, please indicate a new weight and explain this in your report overleaf.

Heading	Mark %	Weight	Weighted Mark
Abstract, overview, description and motivation of research question, research objectives		0.1	
Introduction. Scope and context of the investigation and problem to be solved. Overall challenge of the project.		0.1	
Background. Amount and quality of background research, use of literature.		0.2	
Research methods. Theory and design of artefact: description & understanding of topic/problems, awareness and solutions to technical/scientific challenges. Description, technical quality & expected results of implementation or empirical work.		0.4	
Understanding. Critical analysis & evaluation, conclusion, summary of achievements, reflection, identification of improvements/further work. Presentation and structure		0.1	
References properly used, complete references given & formatting		0.1	
<b>Report Total (out of 100)</b>			

### Part C: Assessment of Presentation & Questioning Session

Heading	Mark %	Weight	Weighted Mark
Completeness. Covered all the main aspects of the project. Well summarised. Coherent and have a clear narrative		0.5	
Response to questions. Demonstrate a deep understanding of the project under the scrutiny of the questions asked.		0.5	
<b>Viva Voce Total (out of 100)</b>			

#### **Part D: Comments**

This part **MUST** be completed by the supervisor including any reader comments. Your comments should give justification for the marks overleaf.

Please include comment on the following aspects:

1. How well the student has displayed an understanding of the background to the project
2. How appropriate the work/research plan is for a 16-week project.
3. How well the student displayed the relevant knowledge and skills at Masters level.
4. The degree of originality shown, commensurate with a 16-week research project.
5. Structuring, literacy, professional presentation of the report.

#### **Examiner's Comments on Report and Project:**

#### **Part E: Agreed Overall Individual Report Mark**

Please record your agreed marks here.

<b>Agreed Mark</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Mark %</b>	<b>Supervisor's Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>Agreed Report final mark. (Out of 100)</b>	0.8			
<b>Agreed Viva Voce final mark. (Out of 100)</b>	0.2			

## Appendix C – Project Proposal Marking Guidance

### **Abstract, Introduction and Motivation (Weight 0.1)**

The abstract is expected to provide a summary of the project including key ideas, expected results and/or achievements. The introduction should “set the scene” and introduce the subject area of the work. The introduction and motivation should also provide a clear explanation of what is involved in your planned masters project and the research proposal. The introduction and motivation section/s should also summarise the contents of the rest of the report. Does the abstract give an appropriate executive summary of the work? How well has the student displayed an understanding of the research and how well has the student motivated it?

**86–100 marks:** Excellent quality, precision, and coverage. The quality is that expected in a scientific paper. Convincing abstract and introduction/motivation. There is proper use of high-quality references. The student has mastered the material. There are practically no mistakes in written English, technical terms and acronyms are always defined.

**70–85 marks:** Very good quality, precision, and coverage. The abstract and introduction/motivation are all clearly presented, with good quality references where appropriate. There is a clear understanding of the technical material. It is well written with very few mistakes in written English, technical terms and acronyms are always defined.

**60–69 marks:** Readable, good solid work with sound technical content and good motivation of the problem. The abstract and introduction/motivation are appropriate. There is good use of references. The written quality is mostly appropriate, but possibly some minor language, style, or English usage issues. Acronyms will be mostly defined.

**50–59 marks:** Work of acceptable or barely acceptable quality demonstrating that the key points described in the abstract and introduction/motivation are understood. Essentially readable but possibly lacking detail, explanations, and/or containing inaccuracies. It is likely that there will be significant problems with either the abstract or introduction/motivation. The main technical points might be understood but this is not completely clear. There will be a good motivation of the problem but possibly overuse of Wikipedia, etc.

**40–49 marks:** Work of quality below the level expected for a master level. It is not clear if the essential points of the research proposal have really been understood. The abstract does not provide an adequate ‘executive summary’ of the work. Summary and/or introduction/motivation are quite weak. Understanding of the problem is minimal. References are minimal, particularly in the introduction/motivation.

**1–39 marks:** Work of poor quality. The report fails to demonstrate that the main points of the research proposal have been understood. There are major difficulties with abstract and introduction/motivation. Poor references.

**0 marks:** The length and format guidelines have been ignored. There is no evidence of any thought about design and no product.

### **Background and References (Weight 0.3)**

This includes the description and understanding of topic/problems, awareness, and solutions to technical/scientific challenges. Suitable background material putting the research proposal in context is expected.

Prompt: Does the background and any theory/design show a level of understanding appropriate for a master level? Has the student undertaken a satisfactory amount of background reading and research? Does the student demonstrate a level of understanding of the subject area and theory at the level expected for a master's degree? In the following, when we say 'artefact', we mean the programme, system, experiment, case study, report, framework, formalism, or mathematical development that the student set out to design and produce later in the master project.

**86–100 marks:** The student has designed and developed an impressive, substantial background for the proposal of an artefact which could be the core of a publication. Considerable creativity, independence, and originality went into this project: the result is impressive. The student has demonstrated a full awareness of the research context and relates well her/his artefact to currently available artefacts in this area. There is proper use of high-quality references.

**70–85 marks:** The student has designed and developed a substantial, well-rounded background for the proposal of an artefact, of good quality in all aspects, with good quality references where appropriate. All the parts work and overall, it shows a good degree of creativity.

**60–69 marks:** This report has produced a solid and convincing background which makes sense and shows a clear level of competence and some level of creativity. There is good use of references. The background may not be impressive and there may be ways in which it could be improved. The size and complexity of the proposed work was acceptable, well within the usual capabilities of a 16-week project. There may be some questionable points, where appropriate, may have some weaknesses.

**50–59 marks:** At this level the student will have completed the background for a modestly complex or relatively straightforward artefact that involved only a little creativity from the student and demonstrated some minimal knowledge. Also, the background is minimally convincing. The research done is not large and did not involve major original ideas from the student, possibly overuse of Wikipedia, etc.

**40–49 marks:** The background may have been completed but the result will not be very large or very complicated. Overall, a student at this level will have achieved relatively little at a master level. References are minimal.

**25–39 marks:** There will be evidence of some work on the background of the proposal. Poor references. It will not have progressed very far, and there will be nothing in a final state.

**1–24 marks:** There is very little design and work towards the background for the research proposal, and no significant knowledge is shown. If the student has had to learn anything, there is no evidence that she/he has managed to use it to do anything related to the research proposal. Poor references.

**0 marks:** The length and format guidelines have been ignored. There is no evidence of any thought about design – and no product.

## **Technical quality, Research Aims/Questions and Research Methodology (Weight 0.3)**

This assesses the main technical quality of the research proposal. It should include a description of the tools/instrumentation and methodology to use. The research aims/questions section should include a description and motivation of the research question(s) or master project specification. Aims and objectives should be given. The student should also cover steps to take to evaluate, test or compare the work to be done in the master project.

Does the research proposal include any original elements of work? How complex and work intensive is the research proposal? Does the student demonstrate a level of understanding of the theory, design, and technical aspects of the research proposal at the level expected for a master's degree? Is the technical quality of the work reported done at a level appropriate for a master's degree? Has the student demonstrated a suitable level of critical analysis and evaluation? How well has the student displayed an understanding of the research question and research aims and objectives? In the following, when we say 'artefact', we mean the programme, system, experiment, case study, report, framework, formalism, or mathematical development that the student set out to design and produce in the project.

**86–100 marks:** The student has designed and developed an impressive, substantial artefact which could be the core of a publication. Considerable creativity, independence, and originality went into this research proposal: the result is impressive. The student has demonstrated a full awareness of the research methodology to employ.

**70–85 marks:** The student has designed and developed a substantial, well-rounded proposal of an artefact, of good quality in all aspects. All the parts work and overall, it shows a good degree of creativity.

**60–69 marks:** This report is describing something solid and convincing which makes sense and shows a clear level of competence and some level of creativity. The proposal of artefact may not be impressive and there may be ways in which it could be improved. The size and complexity of the task done was acceptable, well within the usual capabilities of a 16-week project. There may be some questionable design decisions, where appropriate, may have some weaknesses.

**50–59 marks:** At this level the student will have completed the design and planning of a modestly complex or relatively straightforward proposal of an artefact that involved only a little creativity from the student and demonstrated some minimal knowledge. Also, the design and planning is minimally convincing. The proposal did not involve major original ideas from the student. Its design/planning is at most superficial.

**40–49 marks:** The design of the research proposal may have been completed but the proposed artefact will not be very large or very complicated. The description of the proposed artefact is certainly not complete. Overall, a student at this level will have achieved relatively little at master level.

**25–39 marks:** There will be evidence of some work on the design and/or the development of the research proposal. It will not have progressed very far, and there will be nothing in a final state. Perhaps just some components.

**1–24 marks:** There is very little design and work towards the research proposal, and nothing makes sense. If the student has had to learn anything, there is no evidence that she/he has managed to use it to do anything related to the research proposal.

**0 marks:** The length and format guidelines have been ignored. There is no evidence of any thought about design – and no product.

### **Expected outcomes and conclusions (Weight 0.1)**

This section includes the expected outcomes, conclusions and a summary of achievements, reflection, identification of further work.

Prompt: Are the expected outcomes and conclusions presented based on the work done in the research proposal? Are there any suggestions for future directions and how to implement the proposed work to develop?

**86–100 marks:** Excellent quality, precision, and coverage. The quality is that expected in a scientific paper. Convincing expected outcomes and conclusions. The student has mastered the material. There are practically no mistakes in written English, technical terms and acronyms are always defined.

**70–85 marks:** Very good quality, precision, and coverage. The expected outcomes and conclusions are all clearly presented. There is a clear understanding of the technical material. It is well written with very few mistakes in written English, technical terms and acronyms are always defined.

**60–69 marks:** Readable, good solid work with sound technical content. The expected outcomes and conclusions are all appropriate. The written quality is mostly appropriate, but possibly some minor language, style, or English usage issues. Acronyms will be mostly defined.

**50–59 marks:** Work of acceptable or barely acceptable quality demonstrating the key points described in expected outcomes and conclusions are understood. Essentially readable but possibly lacking detail, explanations, and/or containing minor inaccuracies. The main technical points might be understood but this is not completely clear.

**40–49 marks:** Work of quality below the level expected at a master level. It is not clear if the essential points of the research proposal have really been understood. The expected outcomes and/or conclusions are quite weak.

**1–39 marks:** Work of poor quality. The expected outcomes and conclusions fail to demonstrate that the main points of the research proposal have been understood. There are major difficulties in the expected outcomes and conclusions.

**0 marks:** The length and format guidelines have been ignored. There is no evidence of any thought about design – and no product.

### **Presentation, Structure, Language, and Organisation/Structure (Weight 0.2)**

Does the student demonstrate a proper use of the English language, quality of the prose, clarity of explanations, spelling, punctuation, legibility, relevance of figures, proper use, and formatting of references, etc? Is the research proposal professionally presented? Does the report have the correct structure and demonstrate proper use of the English language? Are the references complete and correctly formatted?

**86–100 marks:** The report is exemplary with an entirely appropriate structure and presentation and conforms to the length and format guidelines (required). The work demonstrates an excellent use of the English language. References are correctly formatted and overall, of high quality and appropriate in number. The report can be used as a model for future students.

**70–85 marks:** The structure and presentation of the report is of very good quality and conforms to the length and format guidelines (required). The written quality is first class with at most a few minor errors. References are almost always correctly formatted and overall, of good quality and appropriate in number.

**60–69 marks:** The structure and presentation of the report is of good quality and conforms to the length and format guidelines (required). The references are mostly appropriate and mostly correctly formatted. The written quality is less than first class with some minor errors and/or inconsistencies.

**50–59 marks:** The report is of acceptable quality with a functional structure and presentation, all the expected elements are present. The report conforms to the length and format guidelines (required). The written quality is basically sound but not always clear without some interpretation. There may be some deficiencies with the references and their formatting.

**40–49 marks:** The report conforms to the format guidelines (required). The structure and presentation of the report is insufficient with incoherencies or gaps. The overall written quality show deficiencies on a larger scale than the occasional typo or badly worded sentence. The references are likely to be poor and poorly formatted.

**1–39 marks:** The report conforms to the format guidelines (required). The structure and presentation of the report is deficient with major incoherencies or gaps. The overall written quality is very poor with numerous mistakes on most pages. The references are inadequate and badly formatted.

**0 marks:** The length and format guidelines have been ignored. There is no evidence of any thought about the writing of the report.

## Appendix D – Project Proposal Feedback Form

The supervisor should complete this form. Students should be given the final version of this form after the proposal has been reviewed.

### **Part A**

**Name of Student:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Provisional Title of Project:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Supervisor:** \_\_\_\_\_

### **Part B: Assessment of Project Proposal**

Please assign numeric values (out of 100) in the mark column. If the default weight is inappropriate, please indicate a new weight and explain this in your report overleaf.

Heading	Mark %	Weight	Weighted Mark
Abstract, Introduction and Motivation		0.1	
Background and References		0.3	
Technical Quality, Research Aims/Questions and Research Methodology		0.3	
Expected Outcomes and Conclusions		0.1	
Presentation, Structure, Language and Organisation/Structure		0.2	
<b>Report Total (out of 100)</b>			

### **Part C: Comments**

This part **MUST** be completed by the supervisor. Your comments should give justification for the marks overleaf.

**Supervisor's Comments on the Project Proposal:**