

---

## Final Year Individual Project Assessment Guidelines

---

### College Grade Boundaries

- First Class (A)  $\geq 70\%$
- Second Class (B) 60 - 69%
- Lower Second Class (C) 50 - 59%
- Third Class (D) 40 - 49%
- Fail  $<40\%$

The college's generic marking criteria can be found at <http://www.kcl.ac.uk/college/policyzone/index.php?id=145>.

## 1 Perfect - 100%

<b>Introduction</b>
Defines the project area and its place within the subject. Proceeds from the wider concerns of Informatics to the specific subject of the report by way of an orderly and natural progression of ideas.
<b>Review</b>
Reviews the background to the project comprehensively. Incorporates relevant issues succinctly. Omits the irrelevant. Identifies all the main issues, which are then analysed and developed. The Review is a penetrating analysis, showing an impressive grasp of the subject and excellent judgement in the selection of previous work that should be applied in project. It gives new insights into the project area, not immediately identifiable from literature.
<b>Specification and Design</b>
From the Review explains the rationale behind the design for the artefact, comparing alternatives and justifying any choices made. Describes the requirements for the artefact succinctly, but in enough detail for reader to appreciate all significant points. There is something distinctly ambitious about what is being attempted and the student has carried off the attempt with style, rarely defeated by problems encountered and more typically finding some clever solution.
<b>Implementation</b>
Displays a systematic and carefully planned approach, with a clear understanding of the material and the methodology. There is something distinctly ambitious about what has been attempted and the student has carried off the attempt with style, rarely defeated by problems encountered and more typically finding some clever solution.
<b>Evaluation</b>
Evaluates the artefact, comparing results expected from theory ( <i>including those for alternative designs</i> ) with those obtained in practice.
<b>Conclusion</b>
States clear conclusions from the work done, <i>making accurate predictions of results that would be obtained by applying the present work in new areas.</i>
<b>Report Quality</b>
Clear, coherent, logical structure to the report. Grammatical, expressive style. Appropriate use of references, diagrams, figures etc. Consistent formatting and correct use of bibliographical conventions.

## 2 Excellent - 90%+

<b>Introduction</b>
Defines the project area <i>and its place within the subject. Proceeds from the wider concerns of Informatics to the specific subject of the report by way of an orderly and natural progression of ideas.</i>
<b>Review</b>
Reviews the background to the project comprehensively. Incorporates relevant issues succinctly. Omits the irrelevant. Identifies all the main issues, which are then analysed and developed. <i>The Review is a penetrating analysis, showing an impressive grasp of the subject and excellent judgement in the selection of previous work that should be applied in project. It gives new insights into the project area, not immediately identifiable from literature.</i>
<b>Specification and Design</b>
From the Review explains the rationale behind the design for the artefact, comparing alternatives and justifying any choices made. Describes the requirements for the artefact succinctly, but in enough detail for reader to appreciate <i>all</i> significant points. There is something distinctly ambitious about what is being attempted and the student has carried off the attempt with style, rarely defeated by problems encountered and more typically finding some clever solution.
<b>Implementation</b>
Displays a systematic and carefully planned approach, with a clear understanding of the material and the methodology. There is something distinctly ambitious about what has been attempted and the student has carried off the attempt with style, rarely defeated by problems encountered and more typically finding some clever solution.
<b>Evaluation</b>
Evaluates the artefact, comparing results expected from theory with those obtained in practice.
<b>Conclusion</b>
States clear conclusions from the work done, <i>making accurate predictions of results that would be obtained by applying the present work in new areas.</i>
<b>Report Quality</b>
Clear, coherent, logical structure to the report. Grammatical, expressive style. Appropriate use of references, diagrams, figures etc. Consistent formatting and correct use of bibliographical conventions.

### 3 Very Good - 80% - 90%

<b>Introduction</b>
Defines the project area.
<b>Review</b>
Reviews the background to the project <i>comprehensively</i> . Incorporates relevant issues succinctly, <i>omitting the irrelevant</i> . Identifies <i>all</i> the main issues, most of which are then analysed and developed.
<b>Specification and Design</b>
From the Review explains the rationale behind the design for the artefact, comparing alternatives and justifying any choices made. Describes the requirements for the artefact succinctly, but in enough detail for reader to appreciate all significant points.
<b>Implementation</b>
Displays a systematic and carefully planned approach, with a clear understanding of the material and the methodology. <i>There is something distinctly ambitious about what has been attempted and the student has carried off the attempt with style, rarely defeated by problems encountered and more typically finding some clever solution.</i>
<b>Evaluation</b>
Evaluates the artefact, comparing results expected from theory with those obtained in practice.
<b>Conclusion</b>
States <i>clear</i> conclusions from the work done, <i>identifying related problems and areas to which the work may be applied.</i>
<b>Report Quality</b>
Clear, coherent, logical structure to the report. Grammatical, expressive style. Appropriate use of references, diagrams, figures etc. Consistent formatting and correct use of bibliographical conventions.

#### 4 Good - 70% - 80%

<b>Introduction</b>
Defines the project area.
<b>Review</b>
Reviews the background to project. Incorporates <i>all</i> relevant issues. Identifies the main issues, most of which are then analysed and developed.
<b>Specification and Design</b>
Explains the rationale behind the design for the artefact comparing some alternatives and justifying choices made. Describes the design for the artefact in enough detail for the reader to appreciate all significant points. Reveals <i>more than mere</i> competence in the application of standard knowledge.
<b>Implementation</b>
Displays a systematic and carefully planned approach, with a clear understanding of the material and the methodology. <i>Reveals more than mere competence in the application of standard knowledge. There is a satisfying quality and thoroughness about the work and it is free from any significant defects.</i>
<b>Evaluation</b>
Evaluates the artefact, comparing results expected from theory with those obtained in practice.
<b>Conclusion</b>
States <i>most</i> of the conclusions that can reasonably be drawn from the work done.
<b>Report Quality</b>
Clear, coherent, logical structure to the report. Grammatical, <i>expressive style</i> . Appropriate use of references, diagrams, figures etc. Consistent formatting and correct use of bibliographical conventions.

## 5 Quite Good - 60% - 70%

<b>Introduction</b>
Defines the project area.
<b>Review</b>
Reviews the background to project. <i>Incorporates some relevant issues</i> . Identifies the main issues, <i>most</i> of which are then analysed and developed.
<b>Specification and Design</b>
Explains the rationale behind the design for the artefact comparing some alternatives and <i>justifying choices made</i> . Describes the design for the artefact in enough detail for the reader to appreciate all significant points. Reveals competence in the application of standard knowledge.
<b>Implementation</b>
The relevant problems were mostly solved and and some unexpected difficulties were resolved to obtain a worthwhile result. <i>Displays a systematic and carefully planned approach, with a clear understanding of the material and the methodology</i> .
<b>Evaluation</b>
Evaluates the artefact, <i>comparing results expected from theory with those obtained in practice</i> .
<b>Conclusion</b>
States some conclusions that can be drawn from the work done.
<b>Report Quality</b>
<i>Clear</i> , coherent, <i>logical</i> structure to the report. Grammatical style, possibly with some errors. <i>Appropriate</i> use of references, diagrams, figures etc. Consistent formatting and correct use of bibliographical conventions.

## 6 Good - 50% - 60%

<b>Introduction</b>
Defines the project area.
<b>Review</b>
Reviews the background to project. Identifies the main issues, some of which are then analysed.
<b>Specification and Design</b>
<i>Explains the rationale behind the design for the artefact comparing some alternatives.</i> Describes the design for the artefact <i>in enough detail for the reader to appreciate all significant points.</i> Reveals <i>some</i> competence in the application of standard knowledge.
<b>Implementation</b>
<i>The relevant problems were mostly solved and and some unexpected difficulties were resolved to obtain a worthwhile result.</i>
<b>Evaluation</b>
Evaluates the artefact.
<b>Conclusion</b>
States some conclusions that can be drawn from the work done.
<b>Report Quality</b>
<i>Coherent</i> structure to the report. <i>Grammatical style, possibly with some errors. Use of references, diagrams, figures etc. Consistent formatting and</i> correct use of bibliographical conventions.

## 7 Relatively Poor - 40% - 50%

<b>Introduction</b>
Defines the project area.
<b>Review</b>
Reviews the background to project. <i>The review is roughly right in what it says but has little to show that the writer really understands the subject.</i>
<b>Specification and Design</b>
Lists some design issues, most of which are relevant. Describes the artefact itself. <i>Discusses very little above a “nuts and bolts” level.</i>
<b>Implementation</b>
<i>The student has done more or less what was intended but has abandoned some aims when faced with unexpected difficulties. The final result is rather modest.</i>
<b>Evaluation</b>
<i>Evaluates the artefact.</i>
<b>Conclusion</b>
States some conclusions that can be drawn from the work done.
<b>Report Quality</b>
<i>Structured report.</i> Comprehensible but not necessarily grammatical style. Correct use of bibliographical conventions.



## 8 Poor - 30% - 40%

<b>Introduction</b>
Defines the project area.
<b>Review</b>
Lists some issues, some of which are relevant to the project.
<b>Specification and Design</b>
Lists some issues, <i>some of which are relevant to the project.</i>
<b>Implementation</b>
<i>The artefact is likely to be fully developed but the original aims of the project are unfulfilled.</i>
<b>Evaluation</b>
-
<b>Conclusion</b>
States some conclusions that can be drawn from the work done.
<b>Report Quality</b>
<i>Comprehensible but not necessarily grammatical style. Correct use of bibliographical conventions.</i>

## 9 Very Poor - 20% - 30%

<b>Introduction</b>
Defines the project area.
<b>Review</b>
Lists <i>some</i> issues, <i>few of which are relevant to the project.</i>
<b>Specification and Design</b>
Describes the artefact.
<b>Implementation</b>
The artefact has not been fully developed.
<b>Evaluation</b>
-
<b>Conclusion</b>
<i>States some conclusions that can be drawn from the work done.</i>
<b>Report Quality</b>
-

## 10 Abysmal - 10% - 20%

<b>Introduction</b>
<i>Defines the project area.</i>
<b>Review</b>
States at least one issue <i>relevant to the project.</i>
<b>Specification and Design</b>
<i>Describes</i> some aspects of the artefact <i>but the description is incomplete.</i>
<b>Implementation</b>
The artefact has not been fully developed.
<b>Evaluation</b>
-
<b>Conclusion</b>
-
<b>Report Quality</b>
-

## 11 Worthless - 0% - 10%

<b>Introduction</b>
<i>States some aspect of the subject area.</i>
<b>Review</b>
-
<b>Specification and Design</b>
<i>States some aspect of the artefact.</i>
<b>Implementation</b>
<i>The artefact has not been fully developed.</i>
<b>Evaluation</b>
-
<b>Conclusion</b>
-
<b>Report Quality</b>
-

*Source: David Clark*