MSc individual project assessment guidelines

The College's grade boundaries for MSc are the following:

Distinction	>= 70%
Merit	60 - 69%
Pass	50 - 59%
Fail	< 50%

Perfect (100%)	
Introduction	Defines the project area and its place within the subject. Proceeds from the wider concerns of Computer Science to the specific subject of the report by way of an orderly and natural progression of ideas.
Review	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.
Specification and Design	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.
Implementation	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.
Evaluation	Evaluates the artefact, comparing results expected from theory (including those for alternative designs) with those obtained in practice.
Conclusion	States clear conclusions from the work done, making accurate predictions of results that would be obtained by applying the present work in new areas.
Report Quality	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.

90% - < 100% (excellent)	
Introduction	Defines the project area and its place within the subject. Proceeds from the wider concerns of Computer Science to the specific subject of the report by way of an orderly and natural progression of ideas.
Review	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.
Specification and Design	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.
Implementation	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

90% - < 100% (excellent)

	problems encountered and more typically finding some clever solution.
Evaluation	Evaluates the artefact, comparing results expected from theory with those obtained in practice.
Conclusion	States clear conclusions from the work done, identifying related problems and areas to which the work may be applied
Report Quality	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.

80% - < 90% (very good)

Introduction	Defines the project area.
Review	Reviews the background to project comprehensively. Incorporates relevant issues succinctly, omitting the irrelevant. Identifies all the main issues, most of which are then analysed and developed.
Specification and Design	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.
Implementation	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.
Evaluation	Evaluates the artefact, comparing results expected from theory with those obtained in practice.
Conclusion	States clear conclusions from the work done, identifying related problems and areas to which the work may be applied.
Report Quality	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.

70% - < 80% (good)

Introduction	Defines the project area.
Review	Reviews the background to project. Incorporates all relevant issues. Identifies the main issues, most of which are then analysed and developed.
Specification and Design	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 more than mere competence in the application of standard knowledge.
Implementation	Displays a systematic and carefully planned approach, with a clear understanding of the material and the methodology. 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.
Evaluation	Evaluates the artefact, comparing results expected from theory with those obtained in practice.
Conclusion	States most of the conclusions that can reasonably be drawn from the work done.
Report Quality	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.

60% - < 70% (quite good)

Introduction	Defines the project area.
Review	Reviews the background to project . Incorporates some relevant issues. Identifies the main issues, most of which are then analysed and developed.
Specification and Design	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 competence in the application of standard knowledge.
Implementation	The relevant problems were mostly solved and and some unexpected difficulties were resolved to obtain a worthwhile result. Displays a systematic and carefully planned approach, with a clear understanding of the material and the methodology.

60% - < 70% (quite good)

Evaluation	Evaluates the artefact, comparing results expected from theory with those obtained in practice.
Conclusion	States some conclusions that can be drawn from the work done.
Report Quality	Clear, coherent, logical structure to the report. Grammatical style, possibly with some errors. Appropriate use of references, diagrams, figures etc. Consistent formatting and correct use of bibliographical conventions.

50% - <60% (satisfactory)

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

40% - <50% (relatively poor)

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

30% - <40% (poor)

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

20% - <30% (very poor)

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

10% - < 20% (abysmal)

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

0% - < 10% (worthless)

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