

Mark Range	Challenge and Achievement	Technical Approach	Critical Interpretation	Report Presentation
80-100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ambitious, challenging project that achieves all of its aims</li> <li>• Could form basis for an academic paper or commercial product</li> <li>• Quality consistent with early career PhD student/high ranking employee</li> <li>• Substantial volume of self directed work</li> <li>• Goes significantly beyond the scope of the degree program</li> <li>• Could be used as a clear example of a model project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Your project's findings represent or advance state-of-the-art</li> <li>• Methodology, tools, and techniques are well motivated and employed correctly throughout</li> <li>• Approaches are well motivated and alternatives considered when appropriate</li> <li>• Very strong command of the relevant tools and techniques with clear evidence</li> <li>• Technical material is handled in a clear and convincing fashion throughout</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extremely well-designed and well-executed comprehensive evaluation</li> <li>• Metrics and techniques are appropriate and generate interesting conclusions</li> <li>• Strong reasoning behind conclusions, supported by effective analysis</li> <li>• Sophisticated and deep critical appraisal that aligns with aims and literature</li> <li>• An appreciation of the relevance of the results for future work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dissertation is clear, accurate and engaging</li> <li>• Quality of the presentation is extremely high</li> <li>• Very few, if any, problems with spelling/grammar</li> <li>• Visualisations are creative, effective, and developed by the student</li> <li>• High visual consistency of all visualisations throughout</li> <li>• Literature review is strong, relevant, and extensive</li> <li>• Appropriate prior work is properly cited</li> <li>• Chosen prior work shows strong understanding of the wider context</li> <li>• The student can answer questions on their topic without significant prompts</li> </ul>
70-79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ambitious, challenging project that achieves all of its aims</li> <li>• Could be further developed into an academic paper or commercial product</li> <li>• Large volume of self-directed work with limited guidance from supervisor</li> <li>• Goes beyond the scope of the degree program</li> <li>• Could be used as a clear example of a very successful project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project's findings are useful</li> <li>• Methodology, tools and techniques are appropriate with some motivation</li> <li>• Some motivation and consideration of alternative approaches</li> <li>• Solid command of relevant tools and techniques, with evidence</li> <li>• Technical material is handled in a clear and convincing fashion</li> <li>• Fixing any technical problems would require minor effort</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A suitably well designed and executed evaluation</li> <li>• Metrics and techniques are appropriate and generate sensible conclusions</li> <li>• Conclusions are supported by argument and evidence</li> <li>• Sophisticated critical appraisal that aligns well with the project aims</li> <li>• Identifies relevant future work and open problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dissertation is mostly clear, accurate, and engaging</li> <li>• Quality of presentation is high</li> <li>• Few spelling/grammar mistakes</li> <li>• Visualisation and illustration is effective throughout the dissertation</li> <li>• Appropriate prior work is properly cited</li> <li>• Chosen prior work shows good understanding of the wider context</li> <li>• The student can answer questions on their topic without significant prompts</li> </ul>

Mark Range	Challenge and Achievement	Technical Approach	Critical Interpretation	Report Presentation
60-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasonably challenging project that achieves almost all of its aims</li> <li>• Some self directed work with significant supervisor input</li> <li>• Remains mostly within the scope of the degree program</li> <li>• Could be used as an example of a good project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project's findings are somewhat useful</li> <li>• Methodology, tools and techniques are employed appropriately for the most part</li> <li>• Some motivation and consideration of alternative approaches</li> <li>• There is some evidence of appropriate use of tools and techniques</li> <li>• Technical material is mostly handled in a clear and convincing fashion</li> <li>• Fixing any technical problems wouldn't require a re-design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some evaluation, that is mostly or wholly suitably designed and executed</li> <li>• Metrics and techniques are appropriate and conclusions generated are consistent</li> <li>• The evaluation presents a critical appraisal and somewhat aligned with project aims</li> <li>• The evaluation contains some consideration of future work or relevant open problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dissertation is easy to understand</li> <li>• The presentation quality is good</li> <li>• Few spelling/grammar mistakes</li> <li>• Visualisation and illustration of reasonable quality</li> <li>• Prior work is properly cited</li> <li>• Chosen prior work shows some understanding of the wider context</li> <li>• The student can answer basic questions without significant prompts</li> </ul>
50-59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A somewhat challenging project that failed to achieve some of its aims</li> <li>• An adequate volume of work but mostly supervisor directed</li> <li>• The scope remains mostly or wholly within the degree program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project findings have some value, even if they mainly replicate existing work</li> <li>• Tools and techniques are reasonable but could have been used more effectively in places</li> <li>• Little consideration for motivating the choice of tools or alternative approaches</li> <li>• Methodology is somewhat ad-hoc or unsystematic in places</li> <li>• Some lack of command of the tools and techniques employed in places</li> <li>• Technical material is sometimes handled in an incorrect or unconvincing fashion</li> <li>• Fixing technical problems would require a small re-design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some evaluation, but it may be poorly designed or executed</li> <li>• Metrics and techniques may not be appropriate or generate only limited conclusions</li> <li>• The critical appraisal may be shallow or not well aligned with the project aims</li> <li>• Little or no useful consideration of future work or relevant open problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dissertation is understandable but may be unclear in places</li> <li>• The presentation quality is satisfactory but may have some big issues</li> <li>• Visualisation and illustration may not be used effectively</li> <li>• Prior work is sometimes incorrectly cited</li> <li>• Chosen prior work misses some key works</li> <li>• The student cannot answer basic questions without significant prompts</li> </ul>

Mark Range	Challenge and Achievement	Technical Approach	Critical Interpretation	Report Presentation
40-49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little challenge, some progress made but failed to achieve main aims</li> <li>• An inadequate volume of work, mostly/wholly supervisor directed</li> <li>• Scope entirely within scope of degree or aligns poorly with Comp. Sci.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project findings are of little value, for example they fail to replicate existing work</li> <li>• Tools and techniques are mis-applied or not always appropriate</li> <li>• Little consideration if any of the choice of tools or alternatives</li> <li>• Methodology is ad-hoc or unsystematic in places</li> <li>• Some lack of the command of tools and techniques employed</li> <li>• Technical material is handled unconvincingly or incorrectly</li> <li>• Fixing technical problems would require a substantial effort/re-design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very little evaluation - poorly designed or executed</li> <li>• Metrics and techniques may not be appropriate, with no or very limited useful conclusions</li> <li>• The appraisal may be shallow or only partially applicable to the project aims</li> <li>• Little or no useful consideration of future work or relevant open problems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dissertation is hard to read in certain areas</li> <li>• Presentation is weak, key concepts cannot be understood</li> <li>• Visualisation is absent, ineffective, or visually inconsistent</li> <li>• Very little prior work cited, sometimes incorrectly</li> <li>• Chosen prior work misses key works</li> <li>• The student cannot answer basic questions without prompts or at all</li> </ul>
0-39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trivial challenge with very little progress towards aims</li> <li>• Inadequate volume of work with little self direction</li> <li>• Scope entirely within scope of degree or aligns poorly with Comp. Sci.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project findings have no value, or almost no value</li> <li>• Tools and techniques are mis-applied, or not appropriate</li> <li>• Little or no consideration of the choice of tools, or of alternatives</li> <li>• Methodology is unsystematic or absent throughout</li> <li>• Evidence of a profound lack of command of the tools and techniques employed</li> <li>• Technical material is handled incorrectly or unconvincingly throughout</li> <li>• Fixing technical problems would require restarting the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation is superficial, incoherent or completely absent</li> <li>• Little or no useful conclusions are reached</li> <li>• Very little to no critical appraisal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dissertation is frequently very difficult to understand</li> <li>• Presentation is poor, the reader cannot understand discussion points</li> <li>• Visualisation is either absent or confusing offering no help</li> <li>• Very little prior work cited and/or frequently cited incorrectly</li> <li>• Chosen prior work shows misunderstanding of wider context</li> <li>• The student cannot answer basic questions at all</li> <li>• Unclear if the student has done any work on the topic at all</li> </ul>