

Criteria		Low 0-64%	Medium 65-74%	High 75-100%
Organisation and clarity of report (including English expression)		Difficult to read throughout. Important material frequently missing.	Some defects, including completeness, structural oddities or difficult passages. Perhaps difficult to read.	Up to the standard expected of a good conference paper or business report. Well organised. Written coherently and easy to read.
Grasp of the problem and review of the relevant literature	*	Gaps. Lacking in detail. Superficial discussion. Questionable that the group understands the area well.	Thorough literature review discussing important papers and resources. Demonstrates a good understanding of the related work.	Refined synthesis of the literature used to justify the selection of appropriate methods (techniques) used in the study. All papers/resources referenced correctly.
Research method (including data collection and analysis where relevant)	*	Not described or inappropriate methods used or poor execution of method. Limited description of data.	Appropriate methodology, possibly with minor problems with its execution. Further explanation of methods, possibly with additional experiments, was required. Properties of the data clearly presented and analysed.	The methodology developed was appropriate for the problem, well justified, and executed soundly. An appropriate range of techniques/models were examined commensurate with the group size working within constraints of the project. Properties of the data clearly presented and analysed, data collection processes sound.
Presentation of results		Incomplete, meaningless or missing.	Experimental results were presented clearly, with appropriate use of tables and figures. Results were adequately described but not placed in a broader context nor critiqued.	Critical presentation of the results meeting the industry client's expectations. The results were thoroughly analysed (e.g., through specific targeted experiments and error analysis). Places the results in a broader context.
Conclusion and suggestions for future work		Poor or no analysis of outcomes. Poor or no analysis of strengths and weaknesses presented. No extensions to work proposed.	Adequate analysis of outcomes. Some analysis of strengths and weaknesses presented. Modest or no extensions to work proposed.	Detailed analysis of the outcomes, with recommendations given where appropriate. The strengths and weaknesses of the findings were discussed appropriately. Possible extensions to the work were proposed.
Contribution	*	Without merit – the report does not adequately address the industry client's requirements.	Adequate response to the client's requirements/research question. Possibly lacks novelty or significance. However, the volume of work was appropriate for a year-long team effort (given constraints).	Novel, of interest to the industry client and others. The report reflects a significant contribution from the group spanning the year-long time period (given constraints). The outcomes were adequately summarised, with analysis of their strengths and weaknesses.
Additional criteria				
<i>Project management: documentation / repository details</i>		<i>Not supplied.</i>	<i>Some meeting records available. Limited access to logs/code/models.</i>	<i>Accurate record of all meetings available. Detailed repo logs available. Code/ model access provided as required.</i>
<i>Group member peer review</i>		<i>Peer review on Canvas not complete.</i>	-	<i>All group members have completed the peer review on Canvas.</i>

Note:

- Examiners are asked to allocate an overall mark for the report and comments with respect to each criterion.
- The most important aspect of a research project is the degree to which it adds knowledge to the field. Thus it is expected that Contribution, Research Method and Grasp of the Problem (indicated by *) will be the most significant criteria in determining the final mark for the report.
- Assessment is based on the submitted document only.

Overview of score (in terms of the expectation of a research project in CIS)

Having derived a mark for the thesis, examiners check that the mark accords with the descriptions below.

95-100%

Truly outstanding in every way. In an entire academic career such a student project may be encountered only once or twice. The student would be welcome as a PhD candidate in the School and would be expected to succeed with a hands-off supervision style.

90-94%

Excellent in every way. Publishable with only minor revisions. In an entire academic career such a student may be encountered a handful of times. The student would be welcome as a PhD candidate in the School and would be expected to succeed with moderate support.

85-89%

Excellent in many respects. Such students may be in the minority but should be frequently encountered in a typical academic's life. The student would be welcome as a PhD candidate in the School and would be expected to succeed with a hands-on supervision style.

80-84%

The student should succeed as a PhD candidate but would need supervisory support from. For an H1 the student needs to demonstrate an ability to undertake high quality research. They should have a good to exceptional grasp of the relevant literature, have articulated why and how they have undertaken the research, and have presented and analysed the results clearly and with insight.

75-79%

For an H2A the report is very good but has some significant shortcomings also (perhaps missing but important references or poor presentation of results). With substantial rewriting and possibly some extra work the report may be publishable. The student is unlikely to be immediately capable at a PhD.

70-74%

The report is good but has significant shortcomings also. The report may indicate interesting directions but contains nothing of significance in itself. The student has not demonstrated an aptitude for research and significant involvement from supervisors is likely. However, an H2B thesis would not usually be of interest to others in the field and would not usually contain publishable material. Furthermore, an H2B performance does not demonstrate an aptitude for research.

65-69%

The report is good in one or two respects only and has significant shortcomings in other areas. The student is not suited to research.

< 65%

The thesis is of very poor standard for post-graduate research and would suggest that the student is not able to pursue further research. This thesis is complete, but sloppily designed and executed. It has unclear or inaccurate results, with little demonstration of their relevance. It is difficult to read. Important topics omitted. The bibliography has major gaps and is only discussed superficially.