Marking guidance for COMP5530M Group Project
(37449)

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. <u>Depending on the nature of the project, could include:</u> · Description of software prototypes. · Application of existing theoretical techniques to own examples.
Methods	20	· Design 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. <u>Depending on the nature of the project, could include:</u> · Evidence of data collection and preparation. · Schematic diagrams and description of overall software architecture. · Details of project management methodology, *e.g.* sprints.
Results and Discussion	40	· Implementation, with evidence of appropriate validation/testing. · 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. <u>Depending on the nature of the project, could include:</u> · Detailed description of software implementation, with justifications. · Software validation, *e.g.* unit tests, reproduction of known results *etc.* · 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 project process, including reflection and lessons learned. · Discussion of legal, social, ethical and professional aspects.
English Competency	Pass/ Fail	Paragraphs are used. There are links between and within paragraphs although these may be ineffective at times. There are attempts at referencing. Word choice and grammar do not seriously undermine the meaning and comprehensibility of the argument. Word choice and grammar are generally appropriate to an academic text

Marking Rubric for COMP5530M Group Project (37449)

	Background Research	Methods	Results and Discussion	Presentation	Self–appraisal
Excellent ≥80%	Systematic and exhaustive literature review/market survey that follows a scholarly approach and is close to publishable standard. Outstanding introduction, explanation of context, and analysis of existing solutions.	Outstanding justification of all design choices in the context of project requirements. Use of any and all tools, such as version control, of professional standard. If relevant, excellent planning methodology (*e.g.* sprints).	Challenge was significant and goals outstandingly achieved. The resulting solution has substantial complexity and has been thoroughly evaluated. Excellent, detailed ideas for future work.	Outstanding presentation, structure (including appendices), and clarity of writing, all in a suitable language. Exceptional use of display items. Citations correctly formatted.	Excellent discussion of the project process, personal reflection, and lessons learned. Thorough discussion of each of legal, social, professional and ethical issues, including explanations if not relevant.
Very Good 70-79%	Systematic and thorough literature review/market survey that follows a scholarly approach. Context explained very clearly and at a suitable level. Strong analysis of existing solutions.	Excellent justification of design choices in the context of project requirements. Effective and proper use of any and all tools, such as version control. If relevant, planning methodology (*e.g.* sprints) clearly related to project goals.	Challenge was significant and most goals were achieved with competence. The resulting solution has substantial complexity and has been appropriately evaluated. Ideas for future work thought through in some detail.	Clear presentation, structure (including appendices), and writing, in a suitable language. Very good use of display items. Citations correctly formatted.	Insightful discussion of the project process, personal reflection, and lessons learned. Suitable discussion of each of legal, social, professional and ethical issues, including explanations if not relevant.
Good 60-69%	Thorough literature review/market survey that mostly follows a scholarly approach. Context explained clearly and at a suitable level. Good analysis of existing solutions.	Good justification of design choices in the context of project requirements. Proper use of any and all tools, such as version control. If relevant, planning methodology (*e.g.* sprints) described and explained.	The project had a degree of challenge and most of the goals have been achieved. The resulting solution has no serious experimental or procedural shortcomings, and if there were, they were minimal and did not prevent a solid and thorough product. Good ideas for future work.	Well organised into chapters and appendices, and mostly clear writing in a suitable language. Good use of display items. Citations formatted correctly and consistently on the whole.	Fair and honest discussion of the project process, personal reflection, and lessons learned. Some discussion of each of legal, social, professional and ethical issues, including explanations if not relevant.

	Background Research	Methods	Results and Discussion	Presentation	Self–appraisal
Adequate 50-59%	The literature review/market survey covered the main topics but could have been more extensive and/or scholarly in nature. Description of context was clear enough, and there is some analysis of existing solutions.	Some justification of design choices, not necessarily always linked project requirements. Some use of relevant tools, such as version control. If relevant, planning methodology (*e.g.* sprints) described.	Project had a degree of challenge and some of the goals have been achieved. The resulting solution could have been improved within the project timescale, but any shortcomings did not prevent a clear although perhaps basic conclusion. Some ideas for future work.	Reasonably well structured, and language is clear enough to understand the meaning. Display items could have been more effectively deployed. Citations formatted correctly and consistently on the whole.	Some discussion of the project process, personal reflection, and lessons learned. Discussion of some of legal, social, professional and ethical issues.
Marginal 40-49%	The literature review/market survey exhibited some notable omissions and included secondary and/or non–authoritative sources. Context not clearly explained. Analysis of existing solutions was not critical.	Minimal justification of design choices, and those given not linked to project requirements. Some evidence of using relevant tools, such as version control. If relevant, limited planning methodology (*e.g.* sprints) given.	Author has used technical knowledge of taught material to deliver a solution that achieves something. Some minimal evaluation is evident. Few ideas for future work described with little or no detail.	Structure could have been significantly improved. Some text required careful reading, and language not always suitable for a technical report. Limited use of display items. Citation formatting inconsistent.	Limited discussion of the project process, personal reflection, and lessons learned. Discussion of some of legal, social, professional and ethical issues.
Poor <40%	The literature review/market survey exhibited significant omissions and relied on secondary and/or non–authoritative sources. Context barely or not explained. Analysis of existing solutions largely or entirely absent.	Little to no justification of design choices. Limited use of relevant tools, such as version control. Brief or no description of relevant planning methodology (*e.g.* sprints).	Basically no challenging goals have been achieved, and little to no evidence has been provided in the way of evaluation or ideas for future work.	Poor presentation and structure, with unclear/confusing descriptions. Language not suitable for a technical report. Very limited use of display items. Citation formatting frequently inconsistent and/or incorrect.	Very limited discussion of the project process, personal reflection, and lessons learned. Some of legal, social, professional and ethical issues not addressed.
English Competency Pass/Fail	Paragraphs are used. There are links between and within paragraphs although these may be ineffective at times. There are attempts at referencing. Word choice and grammar do not seriously undermine the meaning and comprehensibility of the argument. Word choice and grammar are generally appropriate to an academic text				