UCL Computer Science: Marking Criteria and Grade Descriptors

1-19: Misunderstanding of assignment or similar
20-29: 5 inadequate
30-34: 4 inadequate
34-39: 3 inadequate

		Fail		Pass (2:2)	Merit (2:1)	Distinction (1st)		
		Inadequate	Weak	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Outstanding	Exceptional
		Below 40: BSc: Fail MEng: Fail	40-49: BSc: 3rd MEng: Fail	50-54: Low pass / 55-59: High pass	60-64: Low merit / 65-69: High merit	70-79	80-89	90+
1	Quality of the response to the task set: answer, structure and conclusions	Either no argument or argument presented is inappropriate and irrelevant. Conclusions absent or irrelevant.	An indirect response to the task set, towards a relevant argument and conclusions.	A reasonable response with a limited sense of argument and partial conclusions.	A sound response with a reasonable argument and straightforward conclusions, logical conclusions.	A distinctive response that develops a clear argument and sensible conclusions, with evidence of nuance.		Exceptional response with a convincing, sophisticated argument with precise conclusions.
2	Understanding of relevant issues	Misunderstanding of the issues under discussion.	Rudimentary, intermittent grasp of issues with confusions.	Reasonable grasp of the issues and their broader implications.	Sound understanding of issues, with insights into broader implications.	Thorough grasp of issues; some sophisticated insights.		Exceptional grasp of complexities and significance of issues.
3	Engagement with related work, literature and earlier solutions	Very limited or irrelevant reading.	Significant omissions in reading with weak understanding of literature consulted.	Evidence of relevant reading and some understanding of literature consulted.	Evidence of plentiful relevant reading and sound understanding of literature consulted.	Extensive reading and thorough understanding of literature consulted. Excellent critical analysis of literature.		Expert-level review and innovative synthesis (to a standard of academic publications).
4	Analysis: reflection, discussion, limitations	Erroneous analysis. Misunderstanding of the basic core of the taught materials. No conceptual material.	Analysis relying on the partial reproduction of ideas from taught materials. Some concepts absent or wrongly used.	Reasonable reproduction of ideas from taught materials. Rudimentary definition and use of concepts.	Evidence of student's own analysis. Concepts defined and used systematically/ effectively.	Evidence of innovative analysis. Concepts deftly defined and used with some sense of theoretical context.		Exceptional thought and awareness of relevant issues. Sophisticated sense of conceptual framework in context.
5	Algorithms and/or technical solution	No solution to the given problem, completely incorrect code for the given task.	Rudimentary algorithmic/technical solution, but mostly incomplete.	Reasonable solution, using basic required concepts, several flaws in implementation.	Good solution, skilled use of concepts, mostly correct and only minor faults.	Excellent algorithmic solution, novel and creative approach.		Exceptional solution and advanced algorithm/technical design.
6	Testing of solution (e.g., correctness, performance, evaluation)	No testing or evaluation done.	Few test cases and/or evaluation, but weak execution.	Basic testing done, but important test cases or parts of evaluation missing or incomplete.	Solid testing or evaluation of solution, well done evaluation with good summary of findings.	Very well done test cases, excellent evaluation and very high quality summary of findings.		Exceptionally comprehensive testing, extremely thorough approach to testing and/or evaluation.
7	Oral presentation or demonstration of solution	Poorly done presentation or demonstration, very low quality.	Ineffective oral presentation or demo of the solution.	Able to communicate, present and/or demonstrate solution and summarise work in appropriate format.	Overall good presentation or demo, persuasive and compelling.	Very high quality of delivery. Use of presentation medium with professional style.		Flawless and polished presentation, exceptional quality of demonstration.
8	Writing, communication and documentation	Style and word choice seriously interfere with comprehension.	Style and word choice seriously detract from conveying of ideas.	Style and word choice sometimes detract from conveying of ideas.	Style and word choice work well to convey most important ideas. Well documented.	Style and word choice show fluency with ideas and excellent communication skills.		Reads as if professionally copy edited. Exceptional high quality of writing.
9	Formatting aspects, visuals, clarity, references	Poorly formatted, inappropriate visuals, and incorrect reference formatting.	Formatting, visuals and referencing seriously distract from argument.	Formatting, visuals and referencing sometimes distract from argument.	Formatting well-done and consistent, good visuals and consistent referencing.	Formatting, visuals and referencing are impeccable.		Exceptional presentation, impeccable formatting of the document and references.