Criterion	Weighting	Poor Fail (<35)	Fail (35<39)	Borderline (40-49)	Pass (50-59)	Good MSc Pass (60-69)	Distinction (70-79)	Strong Distinction (80+)
STRUCTURE Understanding of aims Quality of general approach	10%	Hardly any understanding shown Serious lack of organisation	Major failings in understanding, but some things right. Poor organisation.	Sensible but inadequate, perhaps with substantial errors.	A fairly good grasp of issues. Perhaps some errors.	A good grasp of issues. An efficient business-like approach.	A very good grasp of issues. High quality.	An excellent grasp of issues. Exceptionally good quality.
LITERATURE AND THEORY Quality of scrutiny of literature Understanding of relevant theory	10%	Seriously inadequate use of literature. Significant gross misunderstanding.	Shallow use of literature. Major failings in understanding, but some things right.	Adequate but very unambitious pursuit of literature. Some substantial failings in understanding.	Modest initiative shown. A fairly good grasp of issues.	A good study of the literature. A good grasp of issues.	A very good study of the literature. A very strong grasp of the issues.	Excellent, ambitious, inspired, meticulous.
EXPOSITION Quality of exposition of source materials Quality of elaborations of source materials Quality of mathematical argument	20%	Seriously incoherent. No attempt to fill gaps.	Very poor exposition. Elaborations very sketchy or insufficient. Substantial defects in mathematical arguments.	Uninspired and unambitious but with some sensible attempts.	Generally fairly clear and coherent exposition. Some initiative shown. Mathematical arguments mostly sound.	A mostly clear exposition, with clear indications of thought and initiative.	A strong and clear exposition, with thought and initiative.	Excellent, with clear indications of outstandingly good thought and initiative.
METHODOLOGY Appropriateness of choice of techniques Quality of data-collection and/or handling Quality of computer work Accuracy	30%	Gross carelessness. Seriously incorrect techniques. Very serious misunderstanding of computer output.	Careless. Poor and/or ill-considered approaches. Significant misunderstanding of computer output. Serious inaccuracy.	Unambitious and lacking in thought. Perhaps several errors.	Generally sound. Perhaps occasional errors.	Sound and well organised. Appropriate and accurate.	High quality.	Exceptionally assiduous, and of a very high quality throughout.
CONCLUSIONS Appropriateness of conclusions drawn Understanding of implications and limitations	20%	False conclusions. Lack of comprehension of relevant issues.	Poor attempts at drawing conclusions. Poor understanding of relevant issues.	Mainly logical and sensible but uninspired and with clear weaknesses.	Generally sound, with modest evidence of thought.	Thoroughly appropriate. Providing evidence of good understanding.	Very good insights.	Exceptionally good insights.
PRESENTATION Clarity of style Quality of diagrams and tables Proper referencing to the literature	10%	Seriously unclear or muddled expression. Seriously defective graphics and/or tables. Seriously inadequate referencing.	Poor expression. Unclear logic. Very sketchy referencing.	Variable clarity. Satisfactory individual items but insufficient of them. Poor referencing.	Generally clear. Generally sound. Satisfactory referencing.	Clear. Sound. Good referencing.	Very clear, high quality.	Excellent in all regards, meticulous.