# MASTERS SUPERVISOR'S ASSESSMENT: MARKING CRITERIA

| Grade | % | Criteria |
|---|---|---|
| A* | 100<br>95<br>90<br>85 | **Student performance was consistently excellent in all areas throughout the project.** The student played a fundamental role in the design and development of the project; worked consistently hard; was consistently excellent technically; showed consistent awareness of all relevant health and safety issues; engaged seriously with the relevant primary literature; showed excellent attitude in the face of any setbacks; showed initiative throughout the project; showed excellent organisation; and was a consistently constructive member of the research group. A reference would recommend the student for a relevant PhD entirely without reservation. |
| A | 80<br>76<br>72 | **Student performance was excellent overall.** The student attained an excellent level in all areas listed in A* by the end of the project, or was consistently excellent in many of them throughout the project while still having one or a few areas that – though still strong on an absolute scale – are relative weaknesses even at the project's end. This level of performance would be entirely acceptable in a first-year PhD student. |
| B | 68<br>65<br>62 | **Student performed very well overall.** The student always performed to a high standard, though this standard varied over time or among the aspects listed under A*. Alternatively, performance was patchy with some areas of excellence but one or more areas of weak performance. This level of performance would be mostly acceptable in a first-year PhD student but one or more areas need to be addressed. |
| C | 58<br>55<br>52 | **Student performed well overall.** The student performed consistently to an acceptable standard throughout the project and across all the aspects listed under A*, without properly taking ownership of the project or excelling. Alternatively, performance was very patchy, being unacceptable in more than one area. Typically, students at this level will have needed much closer step-by-step supervision than is normal. This level of performance would be seriously concerning in a first-year PhD student. |
| D | 48<br>45<br>42 | **Student did not perform well overall..** The student did not perform to an acceptable standard without unusually close step-by-step supervision across most of the areas listed under A*, and clearly did not meet the standard of performance required of a first-year PhD student. |
| | 35<br>30<br>25 | **Student did not perform acceptably.** The student did not improve unacceptable aspects of performance despite having them pointed out and explained. |
| | 20<br>10<br>0 | **Student performed appallingly.** |