# COMP208/214/215/216 Portfolio Marking Guidelines

The reviewer should use the categories below to form a grade profile of the Project Portfolio. The overall grade is guided by this profile but not necessarily a weighted or averaged grade.

| Grade  Mark |  | Understanding of the project / Background and related work | Aims and objectives | Design | Realisation | Testing | Evaluation | Learning points / Professional issues | Appendices / bibliography | Quality of  project | Quality of  report |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A++  90%–100% | Exceptional  work | Shows critical understanding of project and current knowledge including relevant recent research papers | Described succinctly but in enough detail | Clear and structured; all aspects covered; appropriate design techniques used; design shows exceptional degree of originality and is novel | Delivers novel solutions to problems encountered; all changes to the design are fully justified | Shows thorough testing, all aspects of system tested; well chosen examples; system works as expected for all examples | Shows critical evaluation of strength and weakness | Critical discussion | Appendices used appropriately; clear software documentation; good programming style; references described and cited appropriately; refers to relevant recent research papers | Project aims and objectives fully fulfilled; work shows exceptional degree of originality and/or exceptional analytical and problem-solving skills | Clear and structured; all aspects covered; fluent and succinct presentation; logically developed and coherent |
| A+  80%–89% | Outstanding  work | Shows critical understanding of project and current knowledge with evidence of wide reading | Described succinctly but in enough detail | Clear and structured; all aspects covered; appropriate design techniques used; design shows some originality | Delivers realistic solutions to novel problems encountered; all changes to the design are fully justified | Shows thorough testing, all aspects of system tested; well chosen examples; system works as expected for all examples | Shows critical evaluation of strength and weakness | Critical discussion | Appendices used appropriately clear software documentation; good programming style; references described and cited appropriately; refers to relevant research papers | Project aims and objectives fully fulfilled; work shows some originality and/or the ability to suggest realistic solutions to novel problems | Clear and structured; all aspects covered; fluent and succinct presentation; logically developed and coherent |
| A  70%–79% | Excellent  work | Shows comprehensive understanding of project and knowledge with the ability to put the work into context and to critically evaluate selected aspects of the work | Described clearly but in enough detail | Clear and structured; all aspects covered; appropriate design techniques used | Delivers appropriate solutions to complex problems encountered; all changes to the design are fully justified | Shows thorough testing, all aspects of system tested; well chosen examples; system works as expected for all examples | Shows comprehensive evaluation of strength and weakness | Comprehensive discussion | Appendices used appropriately; clear software documentation; good programming style; references described and cited appropriately | All project aims and objectives fulfilled; demonstrates the ability to solve complex problems | Clear and structured; all aspects covered; fluent and succinct presentation; logically developed and coherent |
| B  60%–69% | Competent  work | Shows good understanding of project and knowledge, with no major gaps or omissions, but minor gaps or omissions may occur | Described in sufficient detail | Mostly clear but may not be structured; most aspects covered; appropriate design techniques used | Delivers appropriate solutions to most problems encountered; most changes to the design are justified | Most aspects of system tested; most examples chosen are appropriate; system works as expected for most examples | Shows good evaluation of strength and weakness | Discussed in sufficient detail | Most of appendices used appropriately; software documentation is mostly clear; good programming style; most references described and cited appropriately | Most project aims and objectives fulfilled; demonstrates the ability to handle relatively complex problems | Mostly clear but may not be structured well; most aspects covered; mostly fluent and succinct presentation; mostly logically developed and coherent |
| C  50%–59% | Satisfactory  work | Shows satisfactory understanding of project and knowledge, with the ability to integrate information but lacking in depth or breadth | Described in some detail | Design is satisfactory but may lack in depth or breadth; some aspects omitted; design techniques used are mostly appropriate | Delivers satisfactory solutions to some problems encountered; some changes to the design are justified | Some aspects of system tested; some examples chosen are appropriate; system works as expected for some examples | Shows satisfactory evaluation of strength and weakness | Satisfactory discussion | Appendices used satisfactorily; satisfactory software documentation; satisfactory programming style; references described and cited satisfactorily | Major project aims and objectives fulfilled; demonstrates the ability to solve well-defined problems of some scope | Report is satisfactory but may lack in depth or breadth; some aspects omitted; satisfactory presentation; partly logically developed |
| D  40%–49% | Adequate  work | Shows general understanding of project and knowledge but very limited in depth or breadth | Description displays some deficiencies and omissions | Unclear design with some faults; quite some aspects omitted; suitable design techniques used for a good part but with flaws in use or with omissions | Flaws in some solutions to problems encountered; very few changes to the design are justified | Some aspects of system tested; Only very few examples are chosen appropriately; system only works for a small portion of the examples | Shows some evaluation of strength and weakness but lacks in depth or breath | Discussion displays some deficiencies and omissions | Appendices and software documentation show some deficiencies and omissions; some source codes are difficult to read; some references described and cited satisfactorily | Some project aims and objectives fulfilled; demonstrate ability to handle limited, well-defined problems of a familiar type | Unclear report with some faults; quite some aspects omitted; clumsy and repetitive presentation; not logically developed |
| E+  35%–39% | Marginal  failure | Shows limited or fragmented understanding of project and knowledge, with some aspects displaying fundamental errors and omissions | Described poorly | Suitable design methods are used to some extend but with flaws in use or omissions which negatively impacts on the work | Deficiencies in most solutions to problems encountered; most changes to the design are not justified | Many aspects of system not tested; examples chosen are not appropriate; system does not work for almost all examples | Shows limited evaluation of strength and weakness | Discussion displays deficiencies and omissions in most aspects | Appendices used poorly; poor software documentation; poor programming style; very few references described and cited satisfactorily | Very few project aims and objectives fulfilled; fails to demonstrate the ability to handle well-defined problems of a familiar type | Displays deficiencies and omissions in a large proportion of the report |
| E-  30%–34% | Non- marginal failure | Shows limited or fragmentary understanding of project and knowledge, with many aspects displaying fundamental errors and omissions | Described poorly | Lack of the use of suitable design methods and/or deficiencies and omissions in a large proportion of the design | Deficiencies in a large portion of solutions to problems encountered; large portion of changes to design are not justified | A large portion of system not tested; poorly chosen examples; system does not work for all examples | Shows limited evaluation of strength and weakness | Discussion displays serious deficiencies and omissions | Poor appendices / software documentation / programming style; very few references described and cited satisfactorily | Very few project aims and objectives fulfilled; fails to demonstrate the ability to handle simple well-defined problems of a familiar type | Displays serious deficiencies and omissions in a large proportion of the report |
| F  20%–29% | Work shows  little effort | Shows incomplete understanding of project and very limited range of knowledge, with numerous errors of interpretation | Described poorly | Serious lack of the use of suitable design methods and/or serious deficiencies and omissions in most of the design | Unable to deal with most problems encountered; changes to design are not justified | Almost no testing was described | Shows very limited evaluation of strength and weakness | Discussion displays serious deficiencies and omissions | Almost no appendices, software documentation, programming style, reference list and citations | Only a few minor project aims and objectives fulfilled; fails to demonstrate the ability to handle simple well-defined problems of a familiar type | Displays serious deficiencies and omissions in most of the report |
| F-  10%–19% | Work shows  little adherence  to the tasks | Shows no understanding of essential principles and concepts and the most limited and fragmentary knowledge, work is likely to be unstructured and ill-presented | Described poorly | Little use of any design methods and very poor design | Unable to deal with any problems encountered | Almost no testing was described | Shows very limited evaluation of strength and weakness | Discussion displays serious deficiencies and omissions | Almost no appendices, software documentation, programming style, reference list and citations | The software is basically not functioning; fails to demonstrate the ability to handle simple well-defined problems of a familiar type | The overall report is unstructured, ill-presented, and very poor |
| G  0%–9% | Nominal or complete lack  of work | Virtually devoid of any evidence of understanding of project and knowledge | The student does not know what the project is about | No use of design methods or virtually no design is given | Virtually no understanding of material or virtually no realization is given | No testing was described | Virtually no evaluation is given | Virtually no discussion is given | Virtually no appendices, reference list and citations | Virtually no software is implemented | The report is almost unreadable or does not exist |