

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 (25%)	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).			
Focus and motivation for work is detailed, with key works in the subject area identified and briefly discussed. (25%)	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 wordby-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.		Key knowledge of the subject area has been identified. There is some knowledge of the topic which has been well connected to the project.		The most impactful work on the subject area has been identified. Key works are strongly connected to the motivations and objectives of the project.	
Work Plan (30%)	No Workplan	Superficial or ill-judged workplan.		Limited detailing. Features unrealistic time-frames. Major project milestones are missing. Poorly presented.		Key project milestones identified and reasonable time allocated to their completion. The plan is learly presented using a relevant visualisation tool e.g. Gantt Chart.		All project milestones identified and reasonable time allocated to their completion. The plan is learly presented using a relevant visualisation tool e.g. Gantt Chart.	
References (10%)	No References	Some references provided. References are not major works in the subject area. Referencing format is non-standard or inconsistent, possibly missing key data.				Key works in the subject area identified. References are complete and presented using a standard and consistent format.			
Technical writing skills and Document Presentation (10%)	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.		