

Marking Criteria	(Zero)	Very Poor (F-2)	Poor (F-1)	Less than adequate (III)	Adequate (II-2)	Good (II-1)	Very Good (I-C)	Excellent (I-B)	Outstanding (I-A)
Aim(s) and Objectives (10%)	No attempt to address any objective/aim or aims and objectives are not appropriate.	Aim(s) do(es) not fully describe the point of the project and what will be achieved. There are too many or too few objectives and some of them are appropriate.			Aim(s) broadly describe(s) the point of the project and what will be achieved and all objectives are appropriate, but a few objectives are missing.	Aim(s) clearly describe(s) the point of the project and what will be achieved. All objectives are appropriate, detailing the individual aspects which need to be achieved in order to deliver the aim(s).			
Breadth of knowledge on the subject area and knowledge of the chosen specific topic as the focus and motivation (10%)	No knowledge of the subject area and topic. No motivation provided.	A limited knowledge of the subject area with no appreciation of context or motivation. Knowledge of the topic is at a superficial level. E.g., very limited and inappropriate review of similar previous work or literature review or inclusion of statements as word-by-word proper quotations from sources (else is plagiarism) with no value added.	Knowledge of the subject area is mostly relevant (but some could be irrelevant) to the project, with some appreciation of the context and motivation. There is some knowledge of the topic and it has been connected to the project up to a degree. E.g., good literature review of the immediate project background with some good examples of research/(industrial) applications.		Knowledge of the subject area is fully relevant to the project, with appreciation of context and motivation. There is some knowledge of the topic which has been well connected to the project. E.g., sound (literature) review of the project area, with awareness of research/applications and relevance.		Knowledge of the subject area is fully relevant to the project, with a full appreciation of context and motivation. There is depth of knowledge of the topic, key work is identified and it has been explicitly connected to the project. E.g., extensive (literature) review of the field and excellent awareness of research/(industrial) applications and relevance.		
Quality and usage of sources (in-text citations) to support content/ development of argument (10%)	No references or citations are used in text.	No evidence of in-text citations or suitable references in the text; e.g., overuse of Wikipedia and internet sites, although there are better alternatives in terms of books/journals/conference papers, or an inappropriate overreliance on a single source.	Lack of suitable references in the text, suitable references from poor sources. References are overall not used correctly to support report content/ arguments. E.g. inappropriate quoting of references. Little use of in-text citation.	Suitable references are used in the text; The range of references is balanced showing variety of sources (as appropriate for the project - books/journals/web/data sheets); Majority of references are from reputable sources. In-text citations are used correctly to support report content/arguments, as appropriate for a computer science context, e.g. "Smith, 2015 says that structures are great.". A few sources in the references are not cited in the text.		A comprehensive range of references are included in the text (books/journals/conference papers/web/data sheets) as appropriate for the project; All references are from reputable sources. In-text-citations are consistently correctly used to support report content/arguments, as appropriate for a computer science context. E.g. "Structures are great (Smith, 2015)". All sources in references are used in the text.			
Understanding of the (theoretical / experimental / analytical / numerical / software development-based / research-based, etc.) methodologies (/ design / techniques / tools / algorithms / technologies, etc.) related to the project (e.g., specification, design, synthesis, etc.) (20%)	No information about methodologies (design / techniques / tools / algorithms / technologies) are provided at all.	Methodologies (design / techniques / tools / algorithms / technologies) used are stated with very little explanation. No evidence of understanding.	Methodologies (design / techniques / tools / algorithms / technologies) outlined are broadly relevant to the topic. Basic, but limited, demonstration of understanding of the conceptual (theoretical)/ practical (experimental)issues surrounding the project topic		Methodologies (design / techniques / tools / algorithms / technologies) are well and logically explained, can be easily followed. The description of work should show a good understanding of the conceptual and practical issues surrounding the project topic.	All methodologies (design / techniques / tools / algorithms / technologies) stated are relevant to the topic. There are appropriate explanations of most methods in relation to the topic.		All methodologies (design / techniques / tools / algorithms / technologies) are relevant to the topic. The description of work should show a complete and thorough understanding of the conceptual and practical issues surrounding the project topic. Complete explanations of all methods in relation to the project.	
Extent of the justification of the (theoretical / experimental / analytical / numerical / software development-based / research-based, etc.) methodologies (/design / techniques / tools / algorithms / technologies, etc.) considered/used for the project. E.g. related to literature / standard practices / performance requirements / specification, etc. (20%)	Absence of justification.	Justification of the (theoretical / experimental / analytical / numerical / software development-based / research-based, etc.) method(s) (/design / techniques / tools / algorithms / technologies, etc.) may have been attempted but mostly irrelevant.	Method(s) (/design / techniques / tools / algorithms / technologies, etc.) are stated with some justification in some parts.	Method(s) (/design / techniques / tools / algorithms / technologies, etc.) are mostly consistent and justified with reference to the literature / previous work. The literature / previous work may be evaluated in parts.		Method(s) (/design / techniques / tools / algorithms / technologies, etc.) are consistently well justified with supporting evidence derived from an explicit evaluation of the literature / previous work.			
Reflection on original workplan (10%)	No reflection on original workplan.	Superficial reflection on original workplan.	Limited to factual statements in reflection on original workplan.	Good reflection on original workplan. E.g.. comments made about plan, implementation, improvements, mistakes, areas of delay and adjustments made.		Reflection to the original workplan takes into account measurable outcomes. Comments on learning to take forward to future planning.		+ Reflection outlines risks and how the risks are mitigated and managed	
Project management (15%)	Failure to manage project time and tasks.	Basic management of project time, resources and tasks. Some ability to apply basic knowledge i.e. already taught material. Some ability to define/identify problems, little consideration of potential/ alternative solutions. (For a group project, role of each individual is not discussed.)			Evidence of regular progress made between meetings. Problems are commonly self identified, some ability shown in consideration of potential/ alternative solutions. (For a group project, role of each individual is clearly discussed.)	Evidence of good and consistent progress being applied over the project. Student (or group) often takes a leading role in meetings. (For a G54GPP project, role of each individual is clearly discussed.)		Excellent management of project time and resources. Progress is excellent/continual/well managed. Student (or group) always takes a leading role in meetings. (For a group project, role of each individual is clearly discussed.)	
Technical writing skills (5%)	Unreadable report, e.g. due to typos/grammatical errors.	Report is unjustifiable in length either short or long, OR report is at the right length, but structured poorly or difficult to follow due to typos/grammatical errors/etc. in some parts.			In the main, the length of the report is good, and there has been an attempt to logically order and structure the report which has been successful in parts. There are a small number of typos or technical language may be lacking in some sections which do not obscure meaning in the main.		Length had been excellently judged with minor amounts of excess or brevity and report is structured to a good standard presenting the work using technical language that is consistent in the entire report. There are no or very few typos in the document and the intended meaning is clear throughout.		