# MSc Project Grading

The MSc project is divided into two separate modules: *project investigation*, and *project*. This document describes the assessment procedure for the project module.

## Step 1

Six sub-component grades are assigned according to the specified criteria. The two most important sub-components (*Description/justification of what was implemented* and *Implementation/Project Achievement*) are given double weighting. This results in a set of eight *subgrades*. The overall grade is calculated from this set of subgrades.

## Step 2

The project is awarded the highest overall grade for which it is eligible. The requirements for each grade are as follows:

### Grade A

At least 4 subgrades of A.

At least 6 subgrades of B or above.

All 8 subgrades at C or above.

### Grade B

At least 4 subgrades of B or above.

At least 6 subgrades of C or above.

All 8 subgrades at D or above.

### Grade C

At least 4 subgrades of C or above.

At least 6 subgrades of D or above.

### Grade D

At least 4 subgrades of D or above.

At least 6 subgrades of E or above.

### Grade E

At least 6 subgrades of E or above.

### Grade F

The report has been submitted, but the set of subgrades does not qualify for any higher grade.

### NS

The report has not been submitted

## Assessment criteria for the project

The sub-component grades for the project module relate to two areas: report, and demonstration

### Report

The grade for this component is to be agreed between the supervisor (first marker) and the second marker. In case of irresolvable disagreement, a third marker will be appointed.

Four components are used to assess the report: the fist two are assigned two grades each, and the remainder are assigned a single grade

#Grades

Description/justification of what was implemented (DESC) 2

Implementation/project achievement (IMP) 2

Evaluation and reflection (EVAL) 1

Report Presentation (PRES) 1

For research-based projects, DESC may also include an extension of the volume 1 literature review. Markers should assess whether all necessary relevant material has been included, bearing in mind the contents of volume 1

### Demonstration

The grade for this component is to be agreed between the supervisor (first marker) and the second marker.

The grade has two subcomponents:

#Grades

Content (CONT) 1

Handling of questions (QUES) 1

*.*

### Final grade calculation for the Project Module

The above components generate eight sub-component grades, given the double weighting of the first two components. These eight grades are combined using the algorithm on the previous page to generate the overall grade for the project module

# Grading Grids

The following grids should be used as the basis for deciding subcomponent grades.

The Robert Gordon University

**ASSESSMENT GRID for** school of computing MSc **Project Report Volume 2**

Student Name Final Grade Course

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** |
| **Definition** | EXCELLENT  Outstanding Performance | COMMENDABLE  Meritorious Performance | GOOD  Highly Competent Performance | SATISFACTORY  Competent Performance | Borderline FAIL  Open To Compensation | FAIL  Unsatisfactory |
| (WEIGHTING)  SOURCES OF ASSESSMENT CRITERIA | IN ALL CASES WITHIN THE LIMITS APPROPRIATE TO THE LEVEL OF STUDY | | | | | |
| **Description/JUSTIFICATION of DESIGN and IMPLEMENTATION details**  **(2 grades)**  (may include some literature summary in addition to that contained in volume 1). | Extremely clear and thorough description/explanation of all relevant details of design and implementation. Thorough and accurate appraisal of alternative choices and justification of choices made. Complete and realistic project plan. | Very good description/explanation of implementation details. Good appraisal of alternative choices and justification of choices made.  Complete and realistic project plan. | Good description/explanation of implementation details. Some appraisal of alternatives and justification of choices made.  Realistic project plan. | Adequate description/explanation of implementation details. Little consideration of alternatives.  Deficient project plan which may be incomplete or inaccurate. | Poor description/explanation of implementation details. | Very poor description/explanation of implementation details. |
| **Project achievement/implementation**  **(2 grades)** | Design fully implemented and meeting project specification. Thorough testing undertaken and documented.  Elegance and/or efficiency a feature of implementation OR the task was unusually demanding. | Design fully implemented and meeting project specification OR a largely complete and correct solution of an unusually demanding task  Substantial testing undertaken and documented. | Implementation largely complete and correct.  Substantial quantities of testing undertaken and documented. | Substantial progress made with implementation, which may be incomplete or inaccurate  Some testing and documentation. | Implementation substantially incomplete or inaccurate.  Inadequate testing and documentation. | Very little actually implemented.  Testing and documentation absent or desultory. |
| **evaluation and reflection**  **(1 grade)** | Thorough evaluation of outcomes and insightful reflection on lessons.  Very good appraisal of any professional, legal, social or ethical issues that have arisen after the completion of the project investigation. Reconsideration of project risks. | Evaluation and reflection both substantial and relevant.  Good appraisal of any professional, legal, social or ethical issues that have arisen after the completion of the project investigation. Reconsideration of project risks | Substantial evaluation and reflection.  Some appraisal of any professional, legal, social or ethical issues that have arisen after the completion of the project investigation. Reconsideration of project risks. | Some evaluation and reflection. | Very little evaluation or reflection. | Absence of evaluation and reflection. |
| **report presentation**  **(1 grade)** | Professional quality of presentation. Logical, clear development of narrative.  All sources of information appropriately acknowledged. | Near-professional presentation. Logical, clear development of narrative.  All sources of information appropriately acknowledged. | Good quality of presentation. Mostly logical and clear development. Sources of information generally acknowledged. | Adequate quality of presentation. Report at least coherent. Some acknowledgement of sources. | Poor presentation. Narrative difficult to follow. | Presentation so poor and narrative so lacking in coherency that report is almost incomprehensible. |

The Robert Gordon University

**ASSESSMENT GRID for** school of computing MSc **Project presentation/DEMO**

Student Name Final Grade Course

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E** | **F** |
| **Definition** | EXCELLENT  Outstanding Performance | COMMENDABLE  Meritorious Performance | GOOD  Highly Competent Performance | SATISFACTORY  Competent Performance | Borderline FAIL  Open To Compensation | FAIL  Unsatisfactory |
| (WEIGHTING)  SOURCES OF ASSESSMENT CRITERIA | IN ALL CASES WITHIN THE LIMITS APPROPRIATE TO THE LEVEL OF STUDY | | | | | |
| oral presenT-ation and DEMO **(1 GRADE)** | All aspects (problem statement, project achievement, future work) fully described and illustrated during the oral presentation and demonstrated where appropriate. Excellent presentation flow and quality of explanations. Excellent critical appraisal of the project.  Excellent timing with presentation no longer than 15 minutes. | All or nearly all aspects described, and illustrated during the oral presentation and demonstrated where appropriate.  ~Very good presentation flow and quality of explanations. Very good critical appraisal of the project.  Very good timing with presentation no longer than 15 minutes. | Most aspects described and illustrated during the oral presentation and demonstrated where appropriate. Good presentation flow and quality of explanations Good critical appraisal of the project.  Good timing with presentation no longer than 15 minutes. | Adequate description and demonstration of project and project achievement. Adequate presentation flow and quality of explanations. Adequate critical appraisal of the project.  Adequate timing with presentation no longer than 15 minutes. | Poor description and demonstration of project and project achievement. | Little useful information conveyed. |
| **poster AND handling of QUESTIONS**  **(1 GRADE)** | Excellent poster including structure, content and visual aids (text/figures/charts). Clear and concise messages covering all aspects of the project.  Clear and concise response to questions. Deep understanding shown. Accommodating, but critical, attitude to alternative ideas. | Very good poster including structure, content and visual aids (text/figures/charts). Clear and concise messages covering nearly all aspects of the project.  Clear and concise response to questions. Good understanding and attitude to alternative ideas. | Good poster including structure, content and visual aids (text/figures/charts). Clear and concise messages covering most aspects of the project.  Mostly clear and concise response to questions. Good understanding and attitude to alternative ideas. | Adequate poster with reasonable structure. The content coves some aspects of the project. Messages not always clear or concise.  Mostly clear and concise response to questions. Some understanding shown. | Poor poster with serious deficiencies in structure and/or content.  Poor response to questions. Little understanding shown. | Very poor poster.  No response of value to most of the questions. No understanding shown. |