

INSTRUCTIONS: Use the General Comments box to note the particular strengths and weaknesses of the project, and any factors that are not covered by the rest of the form. Fill in a (%) mark for each of the four key areas, see overleaf for more guidance on mark ranges. Underline or highlight key phrases in the descriptions that apply to this project including those overleaf. Fill in an overall (%) mark averaging the four key area marks. The project supervisor (if one of the markers) should also grade the student on their independence (Grades A to F). All parts of the form should be filled in. If the first and second markers cannot agree a mark, tick the Request Third Marker box and omit an Agreed Mark. If the initial marks differ by more than 15% the Request Third Marker box should also be ticked, even if there is an Agreed Mark.

Candidate Code: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Programme: BSc Computer Science

Marker's Name: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Marker's Role: [Choose an item.](#)

Project Title: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Request Third Marker: ☐

General Comments (please write at least two or three sentences):

[Click here to enter text.](#) The box will expand as text is added.

1. Background, Aims and Organisation		Mark (%)
Weak: The student has not understood the aims of the project. The student has failed to place the work in context of the surrounding literature. The student has failed to identify suitable sub-goals.	Strong: The student has clearly understood and stated the aims of the project. There is a suitable literature review which relates to the task. The project is well-organised with suitable sub-goals.	Click here to enter text.
2. Difficulty Level and Achievement		
Weak: The student failed to achieve basic aims. The goals weren't sufficiently ambitious to warrant a whole project. Quality of the work is insufficient. The student has not produced sufficient deliverables.	Strong: The student has achieved all of the stated aims. Project is complex and challenging. The student has produced a considerable body of deliverables in terms of both software and write-up.	Click here to enter text.
3. Clarity		
Weak: The report is unclear or written badly. The write-up is disorganised. Figures and figure legends are of insufficient quality. The presentation is poor. It is hard to understand the core ideas.	Strong: Report is written carefully. Clear structure with a flowing, logical argument. Figures and legends are helpful for understanding the project. It is easy to understand the core ideas.	Click here to enter text.
4. Analysis / Testing		
Weak: For a software-based project there is insufficient testing. Documentation is poor. For a research-based project, there is no critical analysis of the results. Weaknesses and improvements aren't considered.	Strong: For software-based projects there is thorough testing. Analysis of strengths/weaknesses present. Detailed documentation. For research-based projects, there is critical analysis of method and results. Weaknesses and possible extensions are discussed.	Click here to enter text.
Overall Mark		
This is your overall mark given before discussion between the First and Second Markers. BSc Project Pass Mark: 40%. See overleaf for the criteria for each mark range.		Click here to enter text.
Supervision Level		Grade (A-F)
The student required close supervision and did not work independently (Grade F)	The student worked independently and did not overly rely on the supervisor (Grade A).	Click here to enter text.
Agreed Mark		Mark (%)
This is the mark agreed between the First Marker (normally the Supervisor) and Second Marker after discussion. Please summarise how the final mark was agreed on between Markers. This is particularly important where there is a significant difference in marks between the first and second marker, and for borderline cases.		Click here to enter text.
Summary of Marker's Discussion (this must be completed):		
Click here to enter text. The box will expand as text is added. If a mark cannot be agreed clearly explain why.		

Marking Descriptors (underline those that apply, the majority should be in the range corresponding to the overall mark):

Range	Descriptor	Expectations
90-100% Exceptional (1 st)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A clear contribution to the field, of publishable quality, excellent report Strong evidence of considerable extra-curricular reading, critical thought and original interpretation Challenging goals have been fully met, substantial deliverables, research level insight needed Close to faultless in execution and write-up, a high level of independence 	This represents a really outstanding achievement. The project clearly stands out above others. A mark in this range is hard to achieve and rare (< 1%).
80-89% Outstanding (1 st)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential contribution to field, could lead on to publishable work, very good report Good evidence of extra-curricular academic reading, critical thought and original interpretation Only very minor faults in execution, depth of understanding or write-up Challenging project and substantial deliverables, largely self-directed 	Excellent in most respects but doesn't fully meet the criteria for the top range. A small number of projects are in this range each year (3-4%).
70-79% Excellent (1 st)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well written report with a clear logical structure and depth Demonstration of critical thought, understanding and extra-curricular reading Some minor faults in execution or understanding, otherwise carried out effectively, most or all goals fully achieved A good level of challenge, substantial deliverables, and a good level of self-direction 	This represents a straightforward first-class project. Most things have been done well, but there will be some faults or criticisms. The goals have been largely met. A reasonable number of projects can be expected to achieve this level (around 20%).
60-69% Good (2:1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sound project write-up with suitable structure and clarity Evidence of understanding, and at least some evidence of extra-curricular reading and critical thought May contain some ambiguities or faults, not all goals may be fully achieved Reasonable level of challenge, good quality deliverables, satisfactory self-management, with some supervision help needed occasionally 	A good result, that is well on the way to delivering most features, but is not fully complete or finished, or has a lower level of challenge. The majority of projects are likely to be at this level.
50-59% Satisfactory (2:2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate project write-up but lacking clarity or detail in places, or containing irrelevant material Limited evidence of extra-curricular reading or original thought, mostly demonstrates understanding of core issues Some significant deficiencies or incomplete goals, deliverables adequate but of limited quality Project not particularly ambitious or challenging, or could not be completed fully, more significant supervision help required 	A satisfactory result but with limitations. The core features are in place but may be buggy or not that well defined. Enough has been done to present a viable solution, of which at least some parts can be demonstrated. A minority of projects are likely to be at this level.
40-49% Pass (3 rd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak project write-up, lacking content or structure overall, unfocussed or fragmented, but sufficient to show basic achievement Pieces of extra-curricular reading or original thought, but poorly organised Some basic goals in place, enough to show ideas are plausible but large gaps Project not challenging or ambitious, missing or incomplete parts, lack of engagement with supervision 	Sufficient to achieve a basic pass but with a lot of deficiencies. Something working has been produced but is buggy and incomplete. A minority of projects in this range (maybe 10%).
35-39% Borderline fail (Could pass with extra work)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Write-up is sub-standard, with noticeable errors or omissions, but could be made passable within a reasonable time Some clear flaws in understanding, limited or no extra-curricular reading Actual achievements not very substantial or challenging, deliverables of lower quality or incomplete, but could be improved fairly easily Not quite enough challenge or depth demonstrated, required significant supervision or there was a failure to attend tutorials 	The project has enough substance to demonstrate it could be made into a basic pass in a fairly short length of time but is still missing significant features, or the write-up fails to describe what was actually achieved.
0-34% Unsatisfactory (Clear fail)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Write-up is incoherent, rushed, has important omissions or irrelevant material Some serious flaws in understanding, little or no extra-curricular reading A lack of concrete achievements, substantial parts missing Serious lack of challenge or depth demonstrated, required excessive supervision or there was a failure to attend tutorials 	The basis of a viable project may be present but is a long way from being completed. A significant amount of additional work would be needed to reach a passable standard.

Project Classification: 0-39% (Fail); 40-49% (3rd); 50-59% (2:2); 60-69% (2:1); 70-100% (1st)