

Mark Range	Challenge and Achievement	Technical Approach	Critical Interpretation	Report Presentation
80-100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
70-79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 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

Mark Range	Challenge and Achievement	Technical Approach	Critical Interpretation	Report Presentation
60-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dissertation is easy to understand • The presentation quality is good • Few spelling/grammar mistakes • Visualisation and illustration of reasonable quality • Prior work is properly cited • Chosen prior work shows some understanding of the wider context • The student can answer basic questions without significant prompts
50-59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • Prior work is sometimes incorrectly cited • Chosen prior work misses some key works • The student cannot answer basic questions without significant prompts

Mark Range	Challenge and Achievement	Technical Approach	Critical Interpretation	Report Presentation
40-49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dissertation is hard to read in certain areas • Presentation is weak, key concepts cannot be understood • Visualisation is absent, ineffective, or visually inconsistent • Very little prior work cited, sometimes incorrectly • Chosen prior work misses key works • The student cannot answer basic questions without prompts or at all
0-39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation is superficial, incoherent or completely absent • Little or no useful conclusions are reached • Very little to no critical appraisal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • Very little prior work cited and/or frequently cited incorrectly • Chosen prior work shows misunderstanding of wider context • The student cannot answer basic questions at all • Unclear if the student has done any work on the topic at all