

CASA0011 - Assessment Criteria for Coursework 4

	19-20	17-18	15-16	12-14	10-11	7-9	4-6	2-3	0-1
Context and Review (20 Marks)	Evidence of considerable extra-curricular reading with original interpretation.	Evidence of extra-curricular academic reading, critical thought and original interpretation.	Demonstration of critical thought, extra-curricular reading, and excellent understanding of literature.	Evidence of extra-curricular reading, good understanding, sound referencing.	Some evidence of extra-curricular reading understanding of literature, adequate referencing.	Limited evidence of extra-curricular reading, inadequate referencing.	Little evidence of reading, poor or sloppy referencing.	Very little evidence of any reading, very poor referencing with items missing.	No evidence of any reading and no referencing (or almost no referencing).
Communication (20 Marks)	Excellent write up both in terms of readability, clarity and structure, with imaginative presentation of results.	Excellent write up with only minor faults, highly readable, extremely clear with excellent structure.	Good project write up with very clear logical structure and good presentation of results.	Clear project write up with logical structure, possibly with weaknesses in presentation of results.	Adequate write-up, lacking clarity or detail in places, or containing irrelevant material.	Write up is not fully coherent, rushed, contains important omissions or irrelevant material.	Write up is poor, unstructured, some parts missing, writing needing significant improvement.	Major failure in write up structure with missing parts, very poor readability, not at all clear.	Write up substantially absent, incomprehensible or wrong.
Experimental Design (20 Marks)	Extraordinarily ambitious research question. Innovative model. Perfect ODD presentation. Creative & smart experimental approach.	Relevant & meaningful research question. Innovative model. Good ODD presentation. Very good experimental approach.	Interesting & well considered research question. Interesting model, well-presented in ODD format. Sound experimental approach.	A fair research question is posed. An appropriate model presented in ODD format and is used intelligently to address question.	A basic research question is posed and addressed in a basic manner. An attempt to present a model in ODD format.	The research question is either unclear, flawed or not properly addressed by the experimental approach used.	No clear or explicit research question and a consequently unfocussed write-up.	Some sense may be provided of research goals, but no research question and no focus to the write-up.	No goals or focus.
Accuracy of Analysis (20 Marks)	Conclusions are insightful and accurate, avoiding logical fallacies and with excellent understanding of their limitations.	Conclusions are insightful and accurate, avoiding logical fallacies, with meaningful discussion of their limitations.	Conclusions follow clearly from results, are thorough and free from errors, with some discussion of limitations.	Conclusions follow clearly from results, though could be developed and may contain small errors.	Conclusions mostly follow from results, though they may be superficial or contain errors of judgement.	Conclusions do not follow from results presented, contain serious errors, or are extremely superficial.	Conclusions betray a serious lack of understanding of the techniques used.	Conclusions are very limited, irrelevant or entirely incorrect.	Little to no work presented whose accuracy can be assessed.
Coding (20 Marks)	Highly original and complex model; elegant and thoroughly commented code, incl. thorough visualisation of relevant metrics.	An original and fairly complex model. Good coding, well-commented, with evident thought about relevant metrics.	A model of significant originality and some complexity. Fair commenting and some thought about relevant metrics.	A model that builds somewhat on existing examples. Coding is sound, with some commenting.	A basic, but functional model, building a little on existing examples. Code may be inefficient with minor errors.	An undemanding model, broadly functional, drawn largely from existing examples, with minor errors and sloppy coding.	An undemanding model: basic and/or drawn largely from existing examples, with significant errors.	A basic and poorly written model, containing serious errors.	An extremely basic, non-functional or non-existent model.