Project Marking Guidelines

Degree Classification:
3-year BSc: 0-39%=Fail; 40-49%=3rd; 50-59%=2:2; 60-69%=2:1; 70-100%=1st
4-year MEng / MSci: 0-49%=Fail, 50-59%=2:2; 60-69%=2:1; 70-100%=1st
MSc CS / Advanced MSc: 0-49%=Fail, 50-59% overall and 50%+ project=Pass, 60-69% overall and 55%+ project=Merit;
70-100% and 65%+ project=Distinction

Range	Brief summary	Longer description
90-100% Perfect	- Significant contribution to field - Challenging goals, and substantial deliverables, without much help from supervisor - Evidence of considerable extra-curricular reading and original interpretation - Close to faultless in execution and write-up	Work displays an *exceptional* degree of originality and creativity and/or exceptional analytical and problem solving skills. Solution must have novel aspects. The methodology employed is well-developed and correct. Report shows critical understanding of current knowledge. For 60 credit project this should include relevant recent research papers. Perceptive, focused treatment of all issues/questions presented in a critical and scholarly way.
80-89% Outstanding	- Contribution to field - Challenging project and substantial deliverables - Evidence of extra-curricular academic reading, critical thought and original interpretation - Only very minor faults in execution, depth of understanding or write-up	Work displays a level of originality and creativity and/or the ability to develop solutions to novel problems. The methodology employed is well-developed and correct. Report shows evidence of wide reading. For 60 credit project this should include relevant research papers and books. Perceptive, focused treatment of all issues presented in a critical and scholarly way.
70-79% Excellent	- Substantial deliverables - Very well written report with logical structure - Demonstration of critical thought, understanding and extra-curricular reading - Some minor faults in execution or understanding	Work demonstrates ability to analyse, interpret and organise information to produce coherent accounts or solve complex problems. All aspects of a suitable methodology evident and used correctly. Report shows comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the subject together with the ability to put the work into context and to critically evaluate selected aspects of the work. Arguments should be clear, competently structured, and accurate.
60-69% Good	- Achievement not substantial enough to warrant top mark, but execution basically good - Clear project-write up with logical structure - Evidence of understanding, and at least some evidence of extra-reading and critical thought - May contain some ambiguities or faults	Work demonstrates ability to analyse, interpret and organise information to produce coherent accounts or solve moderately complex problems. Use of a suitable methodology evident and used correctly, with minor omissions. Report shows good knowledge and understanding of the subject, with no major gaps or omissions, but minor gaps or omissions may occur. Arguments should be clear, competently structured, and largely accurate.

50-59% Satisfactory	• Project not particularly ambitious, or not entirely completed • Adequate project write-up, lacking clarity or detail in places, or containing irrelevant material • Little evidence of extra curricular reading or original thought • Mostly demonstrates understanding, but with occasional mistakes of judgment	Work displays ability to analyse, interpret and organise information to produce coherent accounts or solve well-defined problems of some scope. Most aspects of a suitable methodology evident and used correctly, some omissions occur but without negative impact on the result of the work. Report shows satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the essentials of the subject, with an ability to integrate information into a clear, well-structured account, but lacking in breadth or depth, or with some significant aspects omitted. Arguments/answers must be clear, although they may not be well-developed or reflect a wider appreciation of the subject. Some errors and omissions are likely to be present.
40-49% Weak	• Actual achievements not very substantial • Write up is somewhat incoherent, rushed, contains important omissions, or irrelevant material • Very little evidence of much extra-curricular reading or original thought • Some serious flaws in understanding	Work demonstrates an ability to solve limited, well-defined problems of a familiar type. Most aspects of a suitable methodology evident, but minor flaws in its use or omissions with some negative impact on the result of the work. Report shows general knowledge and understanding of the subject but very limited in depth or breadth. Arguments/answers are likely to be somewhat lacking in structure. There are likely to be errors and omissions and the evidence provided to support arguments will be very limited.
30-39% Inadequate	• Concrete achievements very few, project goals not nearly achieved • Topic has not been handled at all well • Write up is poor, unstructured, some parts missing. • Little evidence of understanding, many inconsistencies and flaws	Work fails to demonstrate an ability to solve limited, well-defined, problems of a familiar type. Aspects of a suitable methodology evident, but flaws in its use or omissions which negatively impact on the result of the work. Report shows that knowledge and understanding of the subject are fragmentary, some aspects showing a very basic level of understanding but other aspects displaying fundamental errors. Arguments/answers are lacking in structure. There are errors and omissions and the evidence provided to support arguments is very limited.
20-29% Poor	• Actual achievements may be very few or not apparent. • All aspects of the project have been handled badly • Write up is substantially absent, incomprehensible or wrong • Little evidence of understanding, but at least mention of most of the relevant ideas.	Work fails to demonstrate an ability to solve simple, well-defined, problems of a familiar type under guidance. Serious lack of the use of a suitable methodology or flaws in its use which negatively impact on the result of the work. Report shows very limited range of knowledge with many important gaps and omissions. Shows incomplete understanding with numerous errors of interpretation. Arguments have little structure, contain serious errors, and there is no support for arguments.

10-19% Very Poor	• No concrete achievements apparent • Almost total failure to engage with project • Write up substantially absent, incomprehensible or wrong • Some mention of relevant terms, many relevant facts entirely missing	Work shows little evidence of the use of a suitable methodology. Report shows only the most limited and fragmentary knowledge of the subject with little or no understanding of essential principles and concepts. Work is likely to be unstructured and ill-presented. Arguments are only loosely related to issues or only cover a seriously inadequate part of the issues.
0-10% Derisory	• No evidence of any understanding • Mention of some relevant terms • Marks given for presentation of report • Complete ignorance	Work shows no evidence of the use of a suitable methodology. Report virtually devoid of any evidence of knowledge or understanding of the subject. No or almost no arguments.

Adapted with permission from UCL Computer Science Marking Guidelines (left column)
Adapted with permission from University of Liverpool Marking Descriptors (right column)