Table of contents {: .text-delta} 1. TOC {:toc}

Assessment Information

The **project deadline is 28th April 2025**. Submission consists of your dissertation (compulsory) and any auxiliary material (e.g. code), and the submission is digital only.

Your project will be marked by your supervisor (first marker) and a second marker who isn't involved with the project. You will have the chance to talk to your second marker about your project at Poster Day and they will hold the viva with you.

Marking Process

Both your markers will come up with mark suggestions independently. They will do so from reading the thesis and watching/conducting your viva.

Once both mark suggestions have been submitted, these will be shared and then both markers will agree on a final mark for the project.

At this stage, feedback for the project will be collated from both markers.

In the (very) rare case that both markers cannot agree on a final mark, a third backup marker will be brought in to contribute to the discussion.

Viva (Oral Exam)

The second marker will hold your viva which for all purposes is an oral exam. Vivas are **in-person** and **attendance is mandatory** - you will fail the unit if you are not present. Most vivas will be on 13th and 14th May 2025, but due to staff availability, some may be on different dates, so **you must be in Bristol for the full exam period (28th April to 16th May 2025).**

The viva has several purposes: * To showcase parts of the project which cannot (easily) be incoporated into the dissertation. * To get assurance that you have done the work yourself. * To correct any misunderstandings the second marker may have had about the work. * To discuss any mistakes or omissions within the dissertation. * To explore your understanding of the project area.

The viva will start with you giving a 5-10 minute overview of the project. Slides aren't necessary but can be helpful to remind you of what to say.

Mark Scheme

The pass mark is 40 for BSc projects and 50 for MEng.

Your project will generally be marked along four pillars: * Challenge and Achievement * Technical Approach * Critical Interpretation * Report Presentation

These pillars don't represent individual marks that get aggregated, but are guidelines to showcase where a project may lie.

	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	* 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
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	* 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* 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
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	* 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* Prior work is properly cited* Chosen prior work shows some understanding of the wider context* The student can answer basic questions without significant prompts

Challenge and Achievement	Technical Approach	Critical Interpretation	Report Presentation
50* A somewhat challenging 59 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	* 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* Prior work is sometimes incorrectly cited* Chosen prior work misses some key works* The student cannot answer basic questions without significant prompts
40* Little challenge, some 49 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	* 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* 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- * Trivial challenge with very 39 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	* 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* 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

Example Projects

We have selected a variety of student projects from last year covering a wide range of topics and have grouped them based on their mark. Make sure that you look at projects relevant to your unit code (COMSM0142 should look at COMSM0052 as well, as the unit has only run for 1 year).

- High 2.i (65-68) example projects
- First class (70-77) example projects
- Very High First (80+) example projects

Note that these have been anonymised and some pages with identifying information has been removed. Please bear in mind that there is no correlaion between the subjects and the grades, as you are just seeing a selection.

Assessment Support and Guidance

- Request a Coursework Extension

- Exceptional Circumstances Guidance

- What Assessment Support is Available

- Study Support

- Wellbeing Support

- Exam Arrangements

- Guidance on Exam Board Outcomes

- Resits and Supplementary Assessments