

**MA1003 Computing for mathematics – Project proposal task marking criteria (5% of total available module marks)**

Criteria	%	0-40	40-50	50-60	60-70	70-100
<b>Strategy</b> (Bus. model, strategy, regulation, conclusion & executive summary)	40	Does not present adequately 'joined up' strategic thinking. Fails to reach appropriate conclusion.	Inadequate standard of strat. analysis. Provides simplistic or unreasoned conclusion and summary.	Adequate standard of strat. analysis. Suitable conclusion & summary based on market analysis.	Good strat. Analysis. Informed conclusion and summary.	Very good to prof. standard of strategic analysis. Broad, reasoned and informed conclusions & summary.
<b>Market Analysis</b> (Potential customers, marketing strategy, possible competition)	35	Does not consider potential customers or competition. Fails to present marketing strategy.	Description of potential customers and competition only. Marketing strategy unaligned with findings.	Adequate consideration of potential customers and competition. Marketing strategy reflects findings.	Discerning analysis of potential customers and competition with clearly aligned marketing strategy.	Strong to professional market analysis. Strategically aligned and knowledgeable marketing strategy.
<b>Product Definition</b> (Product proposal, value proposition, development planning & tech. targets)	25	Does not provide adequate description or analysis of chosen product or product benefits.	Provides descriptive account of product, benefits and development only. Fails to analyse or evaluate these from strategic perspective.	Satisfactory product proposal and development planning. Demonstrates awareness of strategic value of product benefits.	Comprehensive product proposal and development planning. Identifies strategic value of product benefits.	Clearly defined product proposal and development planning. Capitalises on strategic value of product benefits.

In addition to their specific criteria, the above components will be assessed according to their presentation and critical approach using the following criteria:

<b>Overall Presentation</b> (Spelling, grammar, punctuation, structure, references)		Poor standard of spelling, grammar, and/or punctuation. Inappropriate and confusing structure, incorrect referencing.	Confusing writing style. Many mistakes in grammar, spelling and/or punctuation. Poorly researched, evidenced & presented.	Acceptable writing style. Mistakes in grammar, spelling and/or punctuation. Acceptably researched, evidenced & presented.	Clear writing style. Generally correct grammar, spelling and/or punctuation. Researched, evidenced & presented to good standard.	Articulate writing style. Grammar and spelling wholly accurate. Researched & evidenced to high standard. Professionally presented.
<b>Overall Analysis &amp; Evaluation</b> (Application, analysis and evaluation of knowledge)		Does not provide adequate description. Fails to analyse or evaluate.	Conveys descriptive information only. Little or no attempt made to contextualise, analyse or evaluate points made.	Descriptive information is satisfactorily contextualised, analysed and evaluated. Some consideration of real world feasibility issues.	Descriptive information is competently contextualised, analysed and evaluated. Perceptive consideration of real world feasibility issues.	Very good to professional standard of commercial awareness combined with strong knowledge of relevant industry.