

Criterion					Mark range			
	Outstanding	First	Upper 2nd	Lower 2nd	Third	Borderline Fail	Fail	Missing
	80-100%	70-79%	60-69%	50-59%	40-49%	35-39%	25-34%	0-24%
<b>Artefact</b>	As with first class but demonstrates a particularly comprehensive and well-rounded solution.	Comprehensive solution addressing main task criteria and one or more extensions. Follows good practice.	Good working solution addressing all main task criteria and attempting one or more extensions.	Working solution addressing most of the main task criteria.	Some attempt to address the main task criteria; notes / comments / pseudocode may demonstrate some understanding of concepts / direction.	Minimal attempt to address the main task criteria. No notes / comments / pseudocode.	No significant attempt at the main task criteria; no comments. No notes / comments / pseudocode.	Missing or Inaccessible.
<b>Cover Page and Abstract</b>	A precise and comprehensive overview of the work done including any results and findings. Cover page contains all information.	A comprehensive overview of the work done including any results and findings. Cover page contains all information.	A clear overview of the work done including any results and findings. Cover page contains all information.	A good overview of the work done but does not mention results and/or findings. Cover page may contain errors or omissions.	Basic overview of the work done but omits results and findings. Cover page may contain errors or omissions.	Minimal overview of work done, some aspects may be unclear or incoherent. Cover page contains significant errors and omissions.	Little to no overview of the work done; entirely unclear or incoherent. Cover page missing omits details.	Missing.
<b>What Was Done and How?</b>	As with first class but demonstrates innovative and independent work significantly beyond taught material.	Comprehensive description of work done, with clear evidence of testing, supported by diagrams / tables / snippets. Shows ability to investigate problems thoroughly, demonstrates a thorough understanding of concepts beyond taught material.	Good description of work done; some evidence of testing, with some relevant tables / diagrams / figures. Shows ability to investigate problems. Demonstrates understanding of concepts beyond taught material.	Okay description of work done but some errors or omissions. Minimal supporting figures. Shows ability to investigate problems but solutions not fully thought through. Demonstrates some understanding of concepts, mostly derived from taught material.	Basic description of work done but may contain significant errors or omissions. Irrelevant or missing supporting figures. Shows some ability to investigate problems. Demonstrates some understanding of concepts from taught material but contains significant errors or misunderstandings.	Contains little material addressing work done and has substantial errors and/or omissions. Shows minimal ability to investigate problems. Shows minimal understanding of concepts from taught material.	Contains little material addressing work done and has substantial errors and/or omissions. Shows minimal ability to investigate problems. No obvious understanding of concepts from taught material.	Missing.

<b>Results and Evaluation</b>	As with first class but arguments are particularly insightful and well evidenced.	Demonstrates how well the solution works with evidence. Comprehensive and mature evaluation.	Describes how well the solution works. Sound and logical evaluation.	Mentions the solution working. Some evaluation but may not be consistently convincing.	Little mention of solution working. Some evaluation but comes to weak or unconvincing conclusions.	Minimal mention of solution working. Minimal evaluation. Any material included is unsuccessful and unconvincing.	Little to no evaluation. Any material included is weak or incoherent.	Missing.
<b>Conclusions and Future Work</b>	A comprehensive summary of the work done; clear and precise suggestions for future work.	A comprehensive summary of the work done; clear suggestions for future work. Demonstrates reflective thinking on how the project went, including positive and negative aspects.	A clear summary of the work done; good suggestions for future work. Demonstrates some reflective thinking, may miss positive or negative aspects.	A good summary of the work done; okay suggestions for future work. Some reflective thinking with significant gaps.	Basic summary of the work done; some simple suggestions for future work. Little or no reflective thinking shown.	Minimal summary of work done; suggestions for future work are unclear or incoherent. Minimal reflective thinking shown.	Little to no summary of the work done; suggestions for future work are unclear or incoherent. Little to no reflective thinking.	Missing.
<b>References, Form and Style</b>	Report considered publication quality. No spelling or grammar mistakes. Comprehensively referenced.	Report is a pleasure to read, nicely presented, well structured, very few spelling or grammar mistakes, proper use of figures, etc. Uses multiple references and consistently follow one of the standard schemes.	Report is well presented and structured, few spelling or grammar mistakes, proper use of figures, etc. Uses at least one reference and follows one of the standard schemes.	Report is generally well presented but the structure may be unclear. Some spelling or grammar mistakes, or improper use of figures. Any references are inconsistently formatted or missing bibliographic information.	Report is messy and not well structured. Significant spelling and grammar mistakes and improper use of figures. Any references are poorly formatted and miss relevant bibliographic information.	Report is unstructured and difficult to read. Substantial spelling and grammar mistakes. No use of references.	Report is incoherent and unstructured. Substantial spelling and grammar mistakes. No use of references.	Unreadable.