MMP Formal Assessment Criteria for CS39440, CC39440 and CS39620

A project consists of all of the following:

- a piece of development work which may involve coding to a specification, using a piece of software to design or develop a system, development based on special equipment provided by the department, or some other form of significant development activity.
- a body of documentation, which usually describes, clarifies, extends or in some other way augments the piece of development described above
- a formal interview and project demonstration which will explore the student's insight into the project work and related topics, as well as the level of technical achievement represented by the project work.

Criteria:

In order to achieve a mark in a specific range, the work must satisfy the criteria shown in bold, along with a majority of the remaining criteria for the range.

- **1st: 80-100% An outstanding body of work demonstrating a very deep insight into the problem and presented as such.** Written components will be professionally presented in both layout on the page and logical structure. They will also be impressively presented in an appropriate style and will be grammatically of an extremely high standard. Demonstrates an excellent insight into the technologies employed and uses appropriate terminology accurately. Implementation components will be extremely well finished, will represent a very substantial level of technical achievement, and will more than completely fulfil the functional requirements. The project as a whole will demonstrate a very strong commitment, and will have been approached in a very well organised and well-motivated manner. Results and products of the project will be of publishable research quality and/or of a standard comparable to or better than that found in the products of industry leaders.
- **1st: 70-79% An excellent body of work demonstrating a deep insight into the problem and presented as such.** Written components will be professionally presented in both layout on the page and logical structure. They will also be very well presented in an appropriate style and will be grammatically of a very high standard. Demonstrates an excellent insight into the technologies employed and uses appropriate terminology accurately. Implementation components will be very well finished, will represent a substantial level of technical achievement, and will at least completely fulfil the functional requirements. The project as a whole will demonstrate a strong commitment, and will have been approached in an organised and well-motivated manner. Results and products of the project are likely to be of publishable research quality and/or of a standard comparable to that found in the products of industry leaders.
- **2(i): 60-69% A good body of work demonstrating a good insight into the problem and presented as such.** Written components will be well presented in both layout on the page and logical structure. They will also be presented in an appropriate style and will be of a good grammatical standard. Demonstrates good insight into the technologies employed and a good grasp

of the terminology appropriate. Implementation components will be complete, will represent a reasonably high level of technical achievement, and will usually fulfil the functional requirements in all aspects. The project as a whole will demonstrate commitment, and will have been approached in an organised manner. Results and products of the project would require some rewriting and improvement to be of publishable research quality and are likely to be of a standard slightly below that found in the products of industry leaders.

- **2(ii): 50-59% A body of work which shows insight into the problem in most aspects.** The documents will be structured in a reasonable way which allows them to be easily read, but may be lacking in structure, clarity and grammatical quality. Displays an adequate level of insight into technologies used and mostly uses terminology appropriately. Implementation components, will represent a moderate level of technical achievement, will probably be incomplete in some relatively minor aspects, and may omit some of the more advanced pieces of work. The project as a whole will have been approached in an organised manner. Results and products of the project would require significant rewriting and improvement to be of publishable research quality and are likely to be of a standard significantly below that found in the products of industry leaders.
- **3rd: 40-49% A body of work which shows some insight into the problem.** Written components will show what progress has been made, and make some attempt to show which areas have not been understood. Documents may show a lack of structure, comprehensibility, clarity and grammatical quality. Documents may also be incomplete in coverage of the work undertaken. Probably fails to show insight into the technologies used and often fails to use appropriate terminology. Implementation will represent an identifiable level of technical achievement but is likely to be incomplete and may omit some aspects of the core problem. No adequate attempt to tackle more advanced sections of the work. The project as a whole will have been approached in a disorganised manner and probably demonstrates a lack of commitment. Results and products of the project are likely to be poor and/or incomplete and will be well below publishable quality and of a standard significantly below that found in the products of industry leaders.
- **Fail: 30-39% A body of work which shows poor insight into the problem or which demonstrates an inappropriate, inadequate or incomplete response.** Written components will typically fail to accurately or completely describe the work done and will often contain little indication of which parts of the problem are understood and which are not. Documents often show a lack of structure, comprehensibility, clarity and grammatical quality. Failure to demonstrate insight into the technologies used and lack of or inaccurate use of the appropriate terminology. Implementation represents little or no identifiable technical achievement, is probably drastically incomplete, severely misguided or severely hampered by inability to use the technologies required. The project as a whole will have been approached in a disorganised manner and will demonstrate a lack of commitment. Results and products of the project will be poor and incomplete and will be well below publishable quality and of a standard very significantly below that found in the products of industry leaders.
- **Fail: 20-29% Work which shows very poor or flawed insight into the problem, and an inappropriate, inadequate or drastically incomplete response.** Written components will be poor in terms of presentation and content. They will usually fail to describe the problem, the work done, or to demonstrate the level of insight. They will also lack structure, clarity or

comprehensibility and often be of a poor grammatical standard. The work will often show a failure to identify the technologies required to solve the problem and will not use the correct terminology. Implementation is likely to be absent, drastically incomplete, severely misguided or severely hampered by inability to use the technologies required, with virtually no evidence of technical achievement. The project as a whole will have been approached in a disorganised manner and will demonstrate an almost complete lack of commitment. Results and products of the project will be insignificant, poor and incomplete.

- **Fail: 0-19% Very little work on either implementation or documentation, or a body of work which is very severely flawed by lack of ability to use the required technologies and/or to present the small amount of work done.** Implementation absent, barely commenced or very severely misguided, with no evidence of any technical achievement. Demonstrates no commitment and very little work. Unlikely to generate any products of value at all.

Document History

Date	User	Modification
Pre-2013	mjn/jjr	Mark Neal, 23 April 2003, Jem Rowland, 19 Sept 2005, 29 August 2008, 5 March 2009 (minor changes)
20/02/2013	nst	Added this file to the 2012-2013 website.
10/02/2014	nst/mjn	Reviewed for release in 2013-2014.
26/02/2014	nst	Minor corrections. Released for 2013-2014.

This information is maintained by Neil Taylor, the module co-ordinator. If you have any questions about the Major/Minor Project, please contact Neil Taylor (nst@aber.ac.uk).