

Viva (50%)

| | Distinction | | Merit | Pass | Fail | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| | 15 | | 13 - 14 | 10 - 12 | 7 - 9 | 6-0 |
| (C1) Introduction/Background and Conclusion to dissertation (15%) | Very good introduction and conclusion covering all areas of interest in detail. | | Good introduction and conclusion covering most areas of interest in detail. Some areas a bit sparsely discussed. | Satisfactory introduction and conclusion but lacking detail in most areas. | Introduction and conclusion provides a limited discussion of the key issues associated with the dissertation. | Weak introduction and conclusion given, failing to discuss the issues associated with the dissertation. |
| | 15 | | 13 - 14 | 10 - 12 | 7 - 9 | 6-0 |
| (C2) Coherence of arguments (15%) | Details discussion covering all aspects of dissertation activities and choices made leaving no doubt that appropriate choices have been made. The final deliverable has been reviewed fully with the impact of the dissertation research discussed in context of the research area. | | Justification is given for the choice of dissertation and choices made with some gaps in the arguments. The final deliverable is discussed but the review does provide a clear critical review of the student's achievements. | Satisfactory discussion but lacking in detail. Final findings described but no critical review of the whole dissertation process. | Decision points and research activities mentioned but with little evidence to show any clear/appropriate thinking. Final findings not discussed relating to aim/objectives of dissertation. | Some decision making processes are discussed but lack detail and clarity of the thinking process. |
| | 10 | | 8 - 9 | 6 - 7 | 4 - 5 | 2 - 3 |
| (C3) Communication (10%) | Professional organisation with media fully utilised to showcase the dissertation. High level of cohesion throughout the dissertation process | Good organisation and use of media to showcase the dissertation and deliverables. Evidence of cohesion though not wholly consistent. | Organisation is satisfactory with the student controlling the viva on the whole. Use of media and presentation of deliverable was functional. Evidence of a cohesive dissertation present but not compelling. | Organised but lacking quality media. Deliverable poorly presented though some sense of cohesion communicated. | Student was partially organised but media inadequate and deliverable poorly presented with little sense of a cohesive dissertation process. | No real organisation, deliverable poorly presented and media underutilised. |
| | 10 | | 8 - 9 | 6 - 7 | 4 - 5 | 2 - 3 |
| (C4) Reflection (10%) | Student developed significantly with consistent and comprehensive reflection throughout the dissertation. | Student clearly reflected and developed as the dissertation progressed with reflection applied to key areas of the dissertation. | Satisfactory evidence of reflection with evidence of developed as dissertation progressed though not consistent and not wholly recognised by the student. | Evidence of reflection in some key areas of the dissertation but on the whole unconvincing with the emphasis upon mechanistic progression. | Student able to show improvement as dissertation progressed but inconsistent and without really reflecting before progressing. | No evidence of developed. Student approached the dissertation tasks mechanistically without evidence of reflection. |
| | | | | | | |