

Marking Scheme CSCM10/CSCM10J
Initial Project Report

Scott Yang

2022

	Fail (<40%)	Condonable Fail (40-49%)	Pass (50-59%)	Merit (60-69%)	Distinction (70-85%)	High Distinction (>85%)
Literature Review (30%)	Inadequate review of relevant material and inadequate understanding of the content of the material	Limited review of literature and limited understanding of the content of material	Adequate review of material from readily accessible sources; some understanding of the material presented	Information review includes material from a wide range of sources and has been summarised and evaluated in a sensible and coherent way	Comprehensive review of relevant material; informed evaluation of material demonstrating a thorough understanding	Familiarity with all relevant material; thorough evaluation of material demonstrating a deep understanding
Project Aims, Objectives and Area (30%)	Project area not clearly defined; scant analysis of problem / design	Inadequate presentation of project aims and objectives. Minimal evidence of thought being given to design decisions	Sensible project aims and objectives and some evidence of thought being given to design decisions	Project aims and objectives well presented with design alternatives considered	Clear project aims and objectives with well thought through design decisions	Clear introduction / definition of project. Detailed analysis / methodical presentation of project aims and objectives and design decisions
Bibliography (15%)	Bibliography missing	Bibliography not in an appropriate style	Sources cited incorrectly frequently. Student did not follow directions regarding types of sources.	Some of the sources cited incorrectly. Student followed most of the time directions regarding types of sources.	Most of the sources are cited correctly with a few minor mistakes regarding style. Student followed directions regarding types of sources.	Sources are cited correctly according to a style widely used in computer science research articles. Student followed diligently directions regarding types of sources.
Presentation (25%)	Poorly organised report; inadequate style / grammar; poor tables / diagrams	Inadequate presentation of work done with substantial flaw; poor style / grammar.	Diligent presentation with few flaws, some mistakes regarding style / grammar	Well organised report with high standard of grammar and writing style. A highly satisfactory piece of work, but with identifiable unfulfilled potential	Sensibly organised subdivided material; flawless grammar; relevant, clearly presented, valid material	Report written to a professional standard; independent writing exceeding expectation