

Criteria	Description/ Parts	0-20 %	20-40 %	40-50 %	50-60 %	60-70 %	70-80 %	80-100 %
(5%) Abstract	Clarity, Brevity vs. Completeness; Context and Structure	0Pts Nothing of Merit Not an abstract or not matching with the report	1 Pts Clear Fail Major aspects are missing or significantly too long	2 Pts Marginal Fail Roughly appropriate length; all aspects are present; lacking in clarity, precision, and/or structure	2.5 Pts Satisfactory Appropriate length; all aspects are covered	3 Pts Very good Provides an overview of the project and its achievements; either lacking in clear contextualisation or presentation of own work	4 Pts Excellent Provides a clear and accurate overview of the project and its achievements	5 Pts Outstanding Brief contextualised summation of achievements of the undertaken project
(5%) Introduction	General Overview of the Problem Domain; Embedding in the Field, Current Issues This should include one or more of the following: legal, social, ethical and professional issues; the economic impact; Commercial Risk and Risk Management	0 Pts Nothing of Merit No or very limited contextualisation of the project	1 Pts Clear Fail Limeted or non-matching contextualisation for the project; superfluous or no coverage of relevant issues	2 Pts Marginal Fail At least one of these is lacking: Well defined problem domain; embedding into the wider field; appropriate coverage of the main issues	2.5 Pts Satisfactory Well defined problem domain; embedding into the wider field; appropriate coverage of the main issues	3 Pts Very good Well defined problem domain specifically targeted at the project; considering current events and/or research; appropriate coverage of the relevant issues	4 Pts Excellent Well defined problem domain specifically targeted at the project; considering current events and/or research and its impact on relevant issues	5 Pts Outstanding Demonstrates the relevancy of the problem domain and sets up the role of the project; relevant issues are embedded appropriately
(5%) Specification of the MSc Research Project	Scope of the project; Project Specification; Aims and Objectives; Research Question; Novelty	0 Pts Nothing of Merit No specification, Unclear aims and objectives	1 Pts Clear Fail Some specification of a project with largely unclear aims and objectives	2 Pts Marginal fail Some specification of a project with some aims and objectives but without an overarching goal	2.5 Pts Satisfactory Specified project clear objectives and aims; research questions/ investigation goals are present	3 Pts Very good Specified project clear objectives and aims; research questions/ investigation goals are linked to motivation or literature	4 Pts Excellent Specified project clear objectives and aims; research questions/ investigation goals are motivated/informed by literature; novelty	5 Pts Outstanding Clearly specified project with a novel approach to investigate a problem informed by relevant literature
(15%) Literature Review	Breadth and Depth of Background Research, Appropriate Selection of Sources, Linkage to aims, Identification of a (Research) Gap	0-2 Pts Nothing of Merit No or limited review of the literature	3-5 Pts Clear Fail lacking breadth and depth; either too few sources or many low quality or sources irrelevant to the problem domain	6/7 Pts Marginal Fail lacking breadth or depth; either few sources or low quality or sources irrelevant to the project	8/9 Pts Satisfactory Satisfactory breadth and depth; with relevant literature of mostly appropriate or high quality; attempt at linking literature to the project	10/11 Pts Very good Verg good breadth and depth; relevant core papers or suitable alternatives are cited; linkage of literature to the project; attempted identification of a (research) gap	12/13 Pts Excellent Clear linkage of selected literature to the project of wider field; the (research) gap is clearly evidenced	14/15 Pts Outstanding Well-rounded selection of high-quality literature with a clear identification of a (research) gap linked to the own project with justifications
(15%) Method	The method section highly depends on the type of project. Choice of Methods; Justification and Support of Choices; Use of Tools and Techniques; Data Collection/ Project design; Validation; Feasibility	0-2 Pts Nothing of Merit No strategy to address the aims and objectives is apparent	3-5 Pts Clear Fail Unclear presentation of own approach; chosen methods are unsuitable to achieve the aims and objectives	6/7 Pts Marginal Fail Section mostly limited to own approach; section covers the undertaken work; mostly appropriate choice in methods to achieve the aims and objectives	8/9 Pts Satisfactory Section limited to own approach; appropriate choice in methods; where appropriate with some justification; clear selection of employed techniques/tools	10/11 Pts Very good Clear choice in methods with justification; mostly clear description of methods/techniques/tools	12/13 Pts Excellent Clear choice in methods with justifications; illustrated description of methods/techniques/tools	14/15 Pts Outstanding The way the chosen methods address the research question is clearly illustrated and choices are well supported by literature or own presented arguments
(15%) Results	Results; Suitable Metrics; Appropriate Presentation; Linkage to Objectives and Literature	0-2 Pts Nothing of Merit Results do not address the research question	3-5 Pts Clear Fail Limited use of suitable metrics or results (this includes results dumping)	6/7 Pts Marginal Fail Some results using some relevant metrics or non-appropriate textual or graphical presentation	8/9 Pts Satisfactory Relevant results using relevant metrics; suitable presentation	10/11 Pts Very good Results address the research questions in most aspects; presentation supports (major) results; attempted linkage literature	12/13 Pts Excellent Results address the research questions; presentation highlights findings; some linkage to literature	14/15 Pts Outstanding Additionally outstanding clear and suitable linkage to literature

(15%) Conclusion and Evaluation	Interpretation of Results; Critical Evaluation (versus literature); Summary of achievements; Linkage to Project Aims, Reflection; Further work	0-2 Pts Nothing of Merit Mostly unrelated to the own project	3-5 Pts Clear Fail Unclear achievements; no linkage to aims and objectives; recommendations missing or unconnected to the project	6/7 Pts Marginal Fail Some achievements are presented; revisiting of some aims and objectives; general recommendations only loosely based on the results	8/9 Pts Satisfactory Clear overview over achievements linking back to the aims and objectives; attempted comparison to literature; recommendations based on own results	10/11 Pts Very good Clear overview over achievements linking back to the aims and objectives with comparisons to literature; Identification of limitations; sensible future work recommendations based on own results	12/13 Pts Excellent Discussion of own results in the wider field, especially in the context of the reviewed literature; identification of limitations and suggestions to tackle these in future work; Recommendations linked to own and other researcher's results	14/15 Pts Outstanding Demonstrates a clear understanding of the undertaken work and its results within the wider problem domain; future work and recommendations are sensible and feasible and offer a clear continuation of the (research) project
(10%) References and Citations	Referencing style; In-Text Citations; Completeness and Correctness; Amount and Quality;	0/1 Pts Nothing of Merit Limited and erroneous references and citations	2 Pts Clear Fail Incomplete referencing and in-text citations; frequent mistakes; too appropriate few sources	4 Pts Marginal Fail Some correct referencing and in-text citations; frequent mistakes	5 Pts Satisfactory Satisfactory referencing, minor mistakes, in-text citations used throughout	6 Pts Very good Good use of referencing, occasional mistakes, largely correct in-text citations	7/8 Pts Excellent Excellent referencing, well placed and correct in-text citations	9/10 Pts Outstanding Outstanding referencing, in-text citations
(15%) Presentation	Relevancy of Included Content, Structure of the Report, Word count; Spelling and Grammar; Use of Technical Terms, Consistency,	0/1 Pts Nothing of Merit Incoherent structure and language, far too long or short	2/3 Pts Clear Fail Some appropriate structure and use of technical terms but inconsistently; frequent mistakes in spelling and grammar	4 Pts Marginal Fail Generally appropriate structure and use of technical terms but inconsistently; some mistakes in spelling and grammar, within the word limit	5 Pts Satisfactory Follows a suitable structure; Largely appropriate technical terms; occasional mistakes in spelling and grammar, within the word limit	6 Pts Very good Very good presentation, suitable structure, clear and labelled figures. Very minor grammar/spelling errors.	7/8 Pts Excellent High standard of production, structure tailored to the project, clear, high-quality and labelled figures. Very minor grammar/spelling errors.	9/10 Pts Outstanding Outstanding standard of production, report set out in clear and attractive format. No grammar/ spelling errors.