Criterion	%	**Notes and examples**
Background Research	20	• Problem and context explained at a level suitable for non-experts. • Evidence of a systematic and scholarly approach to background research and relevant literature review. • Critical analysis of existing solutions and techniques. Depending on the nature of the project, could include: • Description of software prototypes. • An empirical study to clarify context. • Application of existing theoretical techniques to own examples. • Requirements and risk analysis, possibly from a stakeholder.
Methods	20	• Design and implementation of the solution, supported by justification of choices made. • For software, evidence that code was properly managed using a version control system, and followed standard good practice in structure. Depending on the nature of the project, could include: • Evidence of data collection and testing. • Derivation of theoretical proofs. • UML class diagrams describing structure of software solution. • Software validation, *e.g.* unit tests, reproduction of known results *etc.* • Details of project management methodology, *e.g.* sprints.
Results and Discussion	40	• Quantitative and systematic approach providing objective evidence of the quality of the solution. • Appropriate technical and/or user evaluation. • Results clearly related to motivation/goals as appropriate. • Outcome of the study and ideas for future work. Depending on the nature of the project, could include: • Performance/complexity/accuracy analysis and interpretation. • Results and discussion of user evaluation questionnaires.
Presentation	10	• Clear, concise and precise presentation and writing style. • Language suitable for technical/academic articles. • Effective use of display items (figures, tables *etc.*) and appendices, properly cited from the main text. • Conforms to the required structure and within the length limit.
Self-appraisal	10	• A critical self-evaluation of the entire project process. • Personal reflection and lessons learned. • Discussion of legal, social, ethical and professional aspects.

%	Min. mark	Criterion
≥ 90	36/40 18/20 9/10	Project displays **most** of the following: • Challenge is significant and goal(s) is (are) outstandingly achieved. • Author has become an expert in the topic. • The resulting solution has significant complexity and has been rigorously evaluated/validated/tested. • Contain work suitable for publication, or a professionally developed software product suitable for further exploitation.
80-89	32/40 16/20 8/10	• Challenge is significant and most goal(s) is (are) achieved with excellence. • Author shows excellent awareness of the literature, relevant methods and relevant evaluation procedures. • The resulting solution has substantial complexity and has been significantly evaluated/validated/tested.
70-79	28/40 14/20 7/10	• Challenge is significant and achieved with competence. • Author shows awareness of the literature, relevant methods and relevant evaluation procedures beyond the taught material. • The resulting solution has substantial complexity and has been appropriately evaluated/validated/tested.
60-69	24/40 12/20 6/10	• The project has a degree of challenge and most of goals have been achieved. • Author shows good grasp of the relevant literature and relevant technical or implementation topics. • The resulting solution has no serious experimental or procedural shortcomings and if there are, these are minimal and do not prevent a solid and thorough product with a good reflection.
50-59	20/40 10/20 5/10	Project displays **most** of the following: • Has a degree of challenge and some of the project goals have been achieved. • Author shows grasps of the basic literature, basic topic's concepts relevant to the topic implementation and or experimental procedures. • The resulting solution could have been improved within the project timescale but any shortcomings do not prevent a clear although perhaps basic conclusion.
40-49	16/40 8/20 4/10	Author has used technical knowledge of taught material to deliver a solution that achieves something. There may have been some minimal evaluation/validation/testing.
< 40		Projects here typically display **most** of the following: • Basically no challenging goals have been achieved. • There is little to no evidence that the author is aware of the relevant literature. • Report significantly lacks in most of the expected thesis components: literature review, evaluation and or implementation. • Writing style is of such low quality that prevents understanding of results, methods and or conclusions.