Mark Range	Challenge and Achievement	Technical Approach	Critical Interpretation	Report Presentation
80-100	- Ambitious, challenging project that achieves all of its aims - Could form basis for an academic paper or commercial product - Quality consistent with early career PhD student/high ranking employee - Substantial volume of self directed work - Goes significantly beyond the scope of the degree program - Could be used as a clear example of a model project	- Your project's findings represent or advance state-of-the-art - Methodology, tools, and techniques are well motivated and employed correctly throughout - Approaches are well motivated and alternatives considered when appropriate - Very strong command of the relevant tools and techniques with clear evidence - Technical material is handled in a clear and convincing fashion throughout * Any AI tool usage benefits the project and they have been cited correctly.	- Extremely well-designed and well-executed comprehensive evaluation - Metrics and techniques are appropriate and generate interesting conclusions - Strong reasoning behind conclusions, supported by effective analysis - Sophisticated and deep critical appraisal that aligns with aims and literature - An appreciation of the relevance of the results for future work	- The dissertation is clear, accurate and engaging - Quality of the presentation is extremely high - Very few, if any, problems with spelling/grammar - Visualisations are creative, effective, and developed by the student - High visual consistency of all visualisations throughout - Literature review is strong, relevant, and extensive - Appropriate prior work is properly cited - Chosen prior work shows strong understanding of the wider context - The student can answer questions on their topic without significant prompts - The student's viva performance is excellent, showcasing their knowledge of the project well.

Mark Range	Challenge and Achievement	Technical Approach	Critical Interpretation	Report Presentation
70-79	• Ambitious, challenging project that achieves all of its aims • Could be further developed into an academic paper or commercial product • Large volume of self-directed work with limited guidance from supervisor • Goes beyond the scope of the degree program • Could be used as a clear example of a very successful project	• The project's findings are useful • Methodology, tools and techniques are appropriate with some motivation • Some motivation and consideration of alternative approaches • Solid command of relevant tools and techniques, with evidence • Technical material is handled in a clear and convincing fashion • Fixing any technical problems would require minor effort * Any AI tool usage benefits the project and they have been cited correctly.	• A suitably well designed and executed evaluation • Metrics and techniques are appropriate and generate sensible conclusions • Conclusions are supported by argument and evidence • Sophisticated critical appraisal that aligns well with the project aims • Identifies relevant future work and open problems	• The dissertation is mostly clear, accurate, and engaging • Quality of presentation is high • Few spelling/grammar mistakes • Visualisation and illustration is effective throughout the dissertation • Literature review is strong and relevant • Appropriate prior work is properly cited • Chosen prior work shows good understanding of the wider context • The student can answer questions on their topic without significant prompts • The student's viva performance is really good, they clearly know their project.
60-69	• A reasonably challenging project that achieves almost all of its aims • Some self directed work with significant supervisor input • Remains mostly within the scope of the degree program • Could be used as an example of a good project	• The project's findings are somewhat useful • Methodology, tools and techniques are employed appropriately for the most part • Some motivation and consideration of alternative approaches • There is some evidence of appropriate use of tools and techniques • Technical material is mostly handled in a clear and convincing fashion • Fixing any technical problems wouldn't require a re-design * Any AI tool usage is sensible and has been cited correctly.	• Some evaluation, that is mostly or wholly suitably designed and executed • Metrics and techniques are appropriate and conclusions generated are consistent • The evaluation presents a critical appraisal and somewhat aligned with project aims • The evaluation contains some consideration of future work or relevant open problems	• The dissertation is easy to understand • The presentation quality is good • Few spelling/grammar mistakes • Visualisation and illustration of reasonable quality • Chosen prior work for literature review shows some understanding of the wider context • Prior work is properly cited • The student can answer basic questions without significant prompts • The student's viva performance is good, they understand their project.

Mark Range	Challenge and Achievement	Technical Approach	Critical Interpretation	Report Presentation
50-59	- A somewhat challenging project that failed to achieve some of its aims - An adequate volume of work but mostly supervisor directed - The scope remains mostly or wholly within the degree program	- The project findings have some value, even if they mainly replicate existing work - Tools and techniques are reasonable but could have been used more effectively in places - Little consideration for motivating the choice of tools or alternative approaches - Methodology is somewhat ad-hoc or unsystematic in places - Some lack of command of the tools and techniques employed in places - Technical material is sometimes handled in an incorrect or unconvincing fashion - Fixing technical problems would require a small re-design * Any AI tool usage have been used sensibly and cited correctly.	- Some evaluation, but it may be poorly designed or executed - Metrics and techniques may not be appropriate or generate only limited conclusions - The critical appraisal may be shallow or not well aligned with the project aims - Little or no useful consideration of future work or relevant open problems	- The dissertation is understandable but may be unclear in places - The presentation quality is satisfactory but may have some big issues - Visualisation and illustration may not be used effectively - Chosen prior work for literature review misses some key works - Prior work is sometimes incorrectly cited - The student cannot answer basic questions without significant prompts - The student's viva performance is satisfactory and they were not sure on very small aspects of their project.
40-49	- Little challenge, some progress made but failed to achieve main aims - An inadequate volume of work, mostly/wholly supervisor directed - Scope entirely within scope of degree or aligns poorly with Comp. Sci.	- The project findings are of little value, for example they fail to replicate existing work - Tools and techniques are mis-applied or not always appropriate - Little consideration if any of the choice of tools or alternatives - Methodology is ad-hoc or unsystematic in places - Some lack of the command of tools and techniques employed - Technical material is handled unconvincingly or incorrectly - Fixing technical problems would require a substantial effort/re-design * AI tools haven't been used appropriately and may be poorly cited.	- Very little evaluation - poorly designed or executed - Metrics and techniques may not be appropriate, with no or very limited useful conclusions - The appraisal may be shallow or only partially applicable to the project aims - Little or no useful consideration of future work or relevant open problems	- The dissertation is hard to read in certain areas - Presentation is weak, key concepts cannot be understood - Visualisation is absent, ineffective, or visually inconsistent - Chosen prior work for literature review misses key works - Very little prior work cited, sometimes incorrectly - The student cannot answer basic questions without prompts or at all - The viva was challenging for the student and there was some small aspects of their project they were unsure about.

Mark Range	Challenge and Achievement	Technical Approach	Critical Interpretation	Report Presentation
0-39	• Trivial challenge with very little progress towards aims • Inadequate volume of work with little self direction • Scope entirely within scope of degree or aligns poorly with Comp. Sci.	• The project findings have no value, or almost no value • Tools and techniques are mis-applied, or not appropriate • Little or no consideration of the choice of tools, or of alternatives • Methodology is unsystematic or absent throughout • Evidence of a profound lack of command of the tools and techniques employed • Technical material is handled incorrectly or unconvincingly throughout • Fixing technical problems would require restarting the project • AI tools haven't been used appropriately and are not cited correctly	• Evaluation is superficial, incoherent or completely absent • Little or no useful conclusions are reached • Very little to no critical appraisal	• The dissertation is frequently very difficult to understand • Presentation is poor, the reader cannot understand discussion points • Visualisation is either absent or confusing offering no help • Chosen prior work for literature review shows misunderstanding of wider context • Very little prior work cited and/or frequently cited incorrectly • The student cannot answer basic questions at all in the project • The viva was very challenging for the student and they were unsure about critical aspects of the project.