

### Project Marking Scheme

	Analysis	Product	Evaluation	Dissertation	Overall
A Excellent	The problem analysis is excellent. The survey is comprehensive. The approach is definitely feasible.	The product is extremely well designed, implemented, and documented.	The evaluation is extremely thorough. There are excellent suggestions for further work.	The dissertation is complete, very well organised, very clear, and highly literate.	An excellent project. Few errors. Shows good judgement and skill in the methods used.
B Very Good	The problem analysis is very good. The survey is wide. The approach i	The product is very well designed, implemented, and documented.	The evaluation is very thorough. There are very good suggestions for further work.	The dissertation is complete, well organised, clear, and literate.	A very good project. Some flaws but the student has demonstrated a high level of competence and initiative.
C Good	The problem analysis is good. The survey is reasonable. The approach is reasonably feasible.	The product is well designed, implemented, and documented.	The evaluation is quite thorough. There are some good suggestions for further work.	The dissertation is nearly complete, fairly well organised, mostly clear, but occasionally less than literate.	A good project. There are flaws but the student has demonstrated competence and initiative.
D Adequate	The problem analysis is adequate. The survey is patchy. The approach is just about feasible.	The product is adequately designed, implemented, and documented.	The evaluation is just adequate. There are unconvincing suggestions for further work.	The dissertation is partly complete, not very well organised, clear in parts, and often less than literate.	A fair project. There are many flaws but the overall performance is satisfactory.
E Weak	The problem analysis is rather confused. The survey is inadequate. The approach is unconvincing.	The product is inadequately designed, implemented, and documented.	The evaluation is barely adequate. There are weak suggestions for further work.	The dissertation is incomplete, disorganised, mostly unclear, and mostly less than literate.	A weak project. There are significant flaws, indicating a lack of understanding of the methods used.
F Poor	The problem analysis is confused. The survey is poor. The approach is ill-conceived.	The product is badly designed, implemented, and documented	The evaluation is inadequate. There are scant suggestions for further work.	The dissertation is scrappy, disorganised, unclear, and less than literate.	A poor project. There are major problems but also signs of some work.
G Very Poor	The problem analysis is very confused. The survey is very poor. The approach is very ill-conceived.	The product is very badly designed, implemented, and documented.	The evaluation is worthless. There are worthless or no suggestions for further work.	The dissertation is very scrappy, disorganised, opaque, and less than literate.	A very poor project. There are major problems and very few signs of any constructive work.
H	No significant attempt	No significant attempt	No significant attempt	No significant attempt	No significant attempt

### Presentation Marking Scheme

	Organisation	Visual Aids	Delivery
A Excellent	Choice of topics to summarise this part of the project indicates an excellent knowledge and understanding of the work done. Handles questions very well, revealing a depth of insight into the work	Very attractive and informative visual aids, communicating effectively a summary of the key points to the audience.	Fluent, confident delivery. Good audience involvement by means of frequent and effective eye contact. Flowing narrative from one topic to next.
B Very Good	Topics chosen indicate a very good knowledge and understanding of the work done. Handles questions well, revealing some insight into the work.	Visual aids are informative in general and succeed in communicating effectively a summary of the key points to the audience.	Mostly fluent, confident delivery. Good eye contact and narrative flow from one topic to next.
C -D Good/ Adequate	Topics chosen indicate some knowledge and understanding of the work, however responses to questions betray little insight into the work.	Visual aids are satisfactory to good, though some of the key issues are lost to the audience, perhaps because there are too many points to be covered in the time available, or the visual aids do not contain enough information.	Hesitant or somewhat hesitant delivery. Some eye contact in places, though mostly faces the screen. Disjointed narrative flow from one topic to next.
E Weak	Topics chosen indicate a weak knowledge and understanding of the problem to be solved, which is also reflected in answers to questions.	Visual aids are weak, with the result that the audience is confused.	Halting delivery. Very little eye contact – possibly reading entirely from notes. Little narrative flow from one topic to next.
F -G Poor/ Very Poor	The content of the talk is minimal or largely inappropriate and reveals a significant lack of knowledge and understanding of the problem to be solved.	Visual aids are poor or non-existent, giving very little benefit to the audience.	Incoherent, disorganised delivery. No eye contact. No narrative flow from one topic to next.
H	No significant attempt	No significant attempt	No significant attempt

### Professional Conduct Marking Scheme

	Organisation
A <i>Exceptional</i> professionalism	The student carried out independent work, was always prepared thoroughly, very effectively applied appropriate tools and made excellent use of your time. For high A grades (A1-A3), this should reflect the level of professionalism you would expect from a professional consultant, and be genuinely impressive on <i>all</i> counts.
B Solid professional conduct	Work was independent, perhaps with some intervention required to keep things moving. Not all best practices followed with minuting meetings or preparing for them, but a clear attempt shown to use time effectively. Acceptable use of tools, but unsophisticated or overcomplicated use of version control, etc.
C Acceptable conduct.	A reasonable level of guidance was required with scoping required by the supervisor throughout the project. Meetings were not always useful or content had to be repeated. Use of tools was present but not clear student was using them effectively.
D Barely acceptable conduct	Significant help in planning and running project required. Unable to take forward project without step-by-step instructions. Suggestions for improvement not taken on board. Meetings were sometimes a waste of time and were missed on occasion. Very limited use of tools
E Unacceptable conduct	Only a limited effort by the student in running the project. Meetings never minuted, little to no preparation for meetings, incorrect or inappropriate use of tools. Student was rude/uncooperative. Failed to follow basic professional practices (e.g. failed to get ethical clearance after being informed to do so).
F Poor conduct	Student needed hand-holding the whole way through the project. Meetings largely wasted. No use of tools. Failed to follow basic practices. Could not be trusted to work on their own. Student failed to communicate or was wilfully obstructive.
G Problematic conduct	Student did not take any responsibility for the project. Student was hostile or effectively absent. No understanding of appropriate tools. Serious violations of basic practices, even after warning.
H	Only if student is never seen during project (this should never happen!).