FACULTY OF SCIENCE, AGRICULTURE AND ENGINEERING

MARKING CRITERIA FOR CSC3032 DISSERTATIONS

(February 2022)

Examiners are expected to use the whole of the marking scale and to interpret these criteria in the context of project. It is important to ensure that feedback comments made on all assessed work justify the final mark awarded based on these descriptors. Clear explanations for any deviations should be given.

- **Introduction** should summarize motivation, aims and objectives, and structure of the dissertation. Any aspects that have changed significantly since the project proposal should be highlighted and explained.
- **Background review** should cover relevant material relating to the problem domain and technologies employed. Sources should be relevant and should be used appropriately (e.g., not over-relying on weak sources). Value should be added by placing the sources in the context of the wider literature and showing their relevance to the project.
- **What was done and how** covers the choice of appropriate methods and tools, which should be well reasoned, as well as the overall project organization. For the higher grades, the dissertation should demonstrate problem solving in contexts beyond the student's prior modules.
- **Results and Evaluation** concerns the quality of products (e.g., models, designs, code), and the process that the student has gone through. The criteria focus on using the results as a basis for sound, justified conclusions, e.g. about the satisfaction of functional or nonfunctional requirements.
- **Conclusion** covers the systematic review of achievements against the project objectives (which should we evidence-based and logically argued), and sound suggestions for future work.
- **Form** covers the structure, organization, quality of writing and non-text forms including graphics and listings.

Element	Mark range							
	Missing	Fail (0-29)	Border fail (30-39)	Third (40-49)	Lower 2nd (50-59)	Upper 2nd (60-69)	First (70-79)	Outstanding (80-100)
Introduction	No Introduction	Some materials but incomplete or incoherent.	Basic introduction to the subject of the dissertation without consideration of motivation, aim or objectives.	Evidence of consideration of motivation, aim and objectives and structure of the dissertation.	Includes a substantial portion of introductory material. Mainly relevant and accurate. There may be some errors or omissions.	Includes most of the expected material. Relevant and accurate. Gives detail.	Thorough introduction including logically structured motivation, aims, objectives and structure for the dissertation.	Comprehensive, concise, and precise introduction that provides a complete motivation, aims, objectives and structure.

Background review	Contains very little background material.	Little use of background sources to form arguments; may lack conclusions.	Little successful use of background material to form arguments; conclusions very weak.	Some successful use of background material to provide context for the project. Weak conclusions.	Uses background material appropriately to support project context. Evidence of analyzing validity and relevance of sources.	Sound logical analysis of evidence to form arguments and draw convincing conclusions.	Well-organized and reasoned evaluation of diverse sources to draw convincing independent conclusions.	Thorough, well-organized, reasoned evaluation of complex and/or diverse sources used to draw strong, independent, convincing conclusions.
What was done, and how	Contains very little material addressing work done. Substantially incomplete or incoherent.	Shows very little ability to apply appropriate methods and tools.	Shows little ability to apply appropriate methods and tools.	Shows some ability to apply appropriate methods and tools in a defined development process.	Shows ability to apply appropriate methods and tools in a suitable and defined process, but process may not be fully thought through.	Shows ability to apply appropriate methods and tools in a justified and well-defined process with few errors.	Shows ability to apply appropriate methods and tools correctly in a justified and well-defined process, with the ability to deliver novel solutions.	Shows ability to apply appropriate methods and tools correctly in a clear, well-thought-out, innovative approach, producing novel solutions with evidence of understanding strengths and limitations.
Results and Evaluation	Little or no indication of results.	Shows very few concrete results; lacks evaluation of results.	Limited description of results; very weak evaluation.	Some description of results and use of evidence to form (possibly weak) evaluation.	Description of results with some use of evidence to perform a broadly sound evaluation with some weaknesses.	Thorough description of results with use of evidence to perform a sound evaluation.	Thorough description of results used as the evidence base for wholly sound evaluation.	Thorough description of results used as the evidence base for well-organized, logically sound and broad-ranging evaluation.

Conclusion	Little or no conclusion.	Very little use of evidence to support conclusions as to progress against objectives.	Little successful use of evidence from the project to support conclusions about progress against objectives.	Some use of evidence from the project to draw weak conclusions on achievements	Use of evidence from the project to draw conclusions on achievements, but these may not be consistently convincing.	Sound analysis of evidence from the project to form arguments and draw convincing conclusions on achievements. Some consideration of possible future work.	Well structured and reasoned use of evidence to draw sound conclusions on achievements and novel proposals for future work.	Well structured and reasoned use of diverse evidence to draw sound conclusions on progress. Convincing and novel proposals for future work.
Form & references	No coherent structure.	Significant omissions in content. Poor structuring and/or substantial language defects make the dissertation difficult to read.	Inadequately structured. Language defects make the dissertation difficult to read.	Adequate presentation; weaknesses in structure. Language defects limit readability. Inadequate use of figures, listings, etc.	Generally well presented although structure may be unclear. Some language defects. Inadequate use of figures, listings, etc.	Well-presented and structured, few spelling or grammar defects. Proper use of graphics, listings, etc.	Well-presented and structured, very few spelling or grammar defects. Good use of graphics, listings, etc. Concise and clear writing.	Well-presented, clear structure, very few language defects. Creative use of graphics, listings, etc. Technical writing style at professional standard.