	University generic criteria	Comp Phys 301 criteria
20 19 18	• Work would be worthy of dissemination under appropriate conditions. • Mastery of advanced methods and techniques at a level beyond that explicitly taught. • Ability to synthesise and employ in an original way ideas from across the subject. • In group work, there is evidence of an outstanding individual contribution. Excellent presentation. • Outstanding command of critical analysis and judgement	• Excellent code, professional quality, clever, efficient and well-documented. • Publication quality report. No typographical errors, excellent presentation and full references. • Academic-level analysis and discussion. • Comprehensive analysis going into considerable depth. Demonstrates considerable initiative and independent research.
17 16 15	• Excellent range and depth of attainment of intended learning outcomes. • Mastery of a wide range of methods and techniques. Evidence of study and originality clearly beyond the bounds of what has been taught. • In group work, there is evidence of an excellent individual contribution. • Excellent presentation. • Able to display a command of critical analysis and judgement.	• Well-written code, well- commented. Efficient and effective. No coding errors or bad practice. • Excellent report, well presented with very few typographical errors. Good references. • Excellent analysis, covering the topics and issues comprehensively and with independence. • Intelligent discussion and clear use of further sources.
14 13 12	• Attained all the intended learning outcomes for a unit. Able to use well a range of methods and techniques to come to conclusions. • Evidence of study, comprehension, and synthesis beyond the bounds of what has been explicitly taught. • Very good presentation of material. • Able to employ critical analysis and judgement. • Where group work is involved there is evidence of a productive individual contribution.	• Good, effective code. No major errors or bad practice. Clearly comprehensible. • Very good report. Well laid-out, possibly some typographical errors or missing references. • Good in-depth analysis demonstrating understanding and independent thinking. • Evidence of wider reading and research.
11 10 9	• Some limitations in attainment of learning objectives, but has managed to grasp most of them. • Able to use most of the methods and techniques taught. • Evidence of study and comprehension of what has been taught. Adequate presentation of material. • Some grasp of issues and concepts underlying the techniques and material taught. • Where group work is involved there is evidence of a positive individual contribution.	• Code is acceptable. It must compile, tackle the prescribed task (not necessarily successfully) and be comprehensible. • Report is acceptable but marginal. Major typographical errors, formatting problems or omissions. • Analysis and discussion are acceptable. Most points required have been investigated, although not necessarily thoroughly, potentially significant misunderstandings.

8 7 6	• Limited attainment of intended learning outcomes. • Able to use a proportion of the basic methods and techniques taught. • Evidence of study and comprehension of what has been taught, but grasp insecure. • Poorly presented. • Some grasp of the issues and concepts underlying the techniques and material taught, but weak and incomplete.	• Coding is maginal, with serious errors, very poor style or documentation. • Report of poor quality, but still comprehensible. • Significant typographical errors or omissions. • Analysis and discussion adequate but marginal in quality and/or quantity.
5	• Attainment of only a minority of the learning outcomes. • Able to demonstrate a clear but limited use of some of the basic methods and techniques taught. • Weak and incomplete grasp of what has been taught. • Deficient understanding of the issues and concepts underlying the techniques and material taught.	• Code submitted but inappropriate, incomprehensible, or does not compile without major modification. • Analysis and discussion present, but either a minimal amount or demonstrating substantial misunderstanding and errors.
4 3 2 1	• Attainment of nearly all the intended learning outcomes deficient. • Lack of ability to use at all or the right methods and techniques taught. • Inadequately and incoherently presented. • Wholly deficient grasp of what has been taught. • Lack of understanding of the issues and concepts underlying the techniques andmaterial taught.	• Some code written, but clearly incomplete, inoperative or incorrect. • Very poor report. • Minimal attempt at analysis, likely incorrect.
0	• No significant assessable material, absent, or assessment missing a "must pass" component.	• No code or report submitted.