

Assessment overview

Assessment	Group Project?	Length	Weight	Learning outcomes assessed	Assessment criteria	Due date and submission requirements	Deadline for absolute fail	Marks returned
Interim Report and Project Plan	No	20 pages max (excl. appendices and references)	15%	1, 2, 3 and 5	Rubric below	Friday 5 PM Week 10 In addition, students must register their Project Details by 5pm Friday Week 5 (see details below)	5 PM Friday week 11	Two weeks after submission

IMPORTANT: You are required to provide the final details (e.g. title, supervisor) of your project before Friday 5 PM, Week 5. Failure to do so will incur in late penalties for your report, as your report will *not* be allocated for marking

Marking criteria and rubrics for Interim Report and Project Plan

Note: The points in the marking criteria will be scaled by the associated weighting in the Marking Criteria Summary.

Marking Criteria Summary

Criterion	Tasks	Weighting	Pages
Literature Review	<p><i>(What is the problem to be solved, and its significance?)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief background to project Summary of literature relevant to project Identification of “gaps” in the literature 	50%	12-15
Research Question and Project Plan	<p><i>(How will the student answer the research question in the given time using their available resources?)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research question Hypothesis and aims Proposed Solution/Experimental Methodology Thesis timeline – for next two terms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Justification of time allocation for each task Available resources identified Required training and upskilling identified 	20%	3-5
Project Dependent Preparations	<p><i>(Can the student achieve the aims in the timeline? What progress has been made already?)</i></p> <p>Project specific, but may include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of training on specific equipment Evidence of some upskilling in new software/methods Preliminary results Preliminary sketches Components/parts ordered Detailed budget of parts to be ordered Risk Assessment 	20%	1-2
Document Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report or slide structure and layout English skills – spelling, grammar Data presentation (if applicable) Clarity of writing Citations consistent and correctly formatted 	10%	N/A

Criterion 1: Literature Review

Grade	Mark	Brief description	Longer explanation / examples
Fail	0-49%	Deficient	Deficient work may be characterized by a number of features, including inappropriate reliance on sources not peer reviewed (such as the internet), not reviewing what should be the core of the literature in a particular area, or not reviewing any recent work (within, for example, the last 5 years although this will depend somewhat on the field).
Pass	50-64%	Adequate	The literature reviewed is sufficient (and includes recent work) to inform the proposed research, although it is likely that further review will be required as the work progresses. What distinguishes work at this level from work at the next level up is quantity: an adequate review of the literature sketches enough that the reader can see what the picture is about but neglects significant aspects. i.e., are there significant holes in this review?
Credit	65-74%	Solid	The most significant areas of literature relevant to the proposed work have been reviewed (including recent work). There are no major "holes". What is generally missing in this band, but present in higher quality work, is the student showing that they understand the conceptual relationships between the different reviewed works.
Distinction	75-84%	Solid, and linked	The most significant areas of literature relevant to the proposed work have been reviewed (including recent work) and the student has clearly identified one or more knowledge gaps. The student will have shown that they understand the conceptual relationships between reviewed works and between reviewed works and the student's research project, i.e., the student makes intellectual connections between the different parts of the review and puts their work in context.
High distinction	85-100%	Of review paper quality	In addition to meeting the quality at the previous band, the student has made a critical assessment of the literature in the context of their research project to a depth and breadth that is of the quality that could be anticipated to be seen in a journal review paper.

Criterion 2: Research Question and Project Plan

Grade	Mark	Brief description	Longer explanation / examples
Fail	0-49%	Broad context missing	The research question is not explained and there is no clear demonstration of student understanding. The research plan is not present or does not have sufficient detail to demonstrate that the student can successfully complete a thesis project. No thesis outline is presented (i.e., thesis chapter headings).
Pass	50-64%	Broad context present No specific plan	Research question and plan are presented, but lack detail and a logical plan of investigation. There is enough of a plan to believe that the research project is feasible. Generic chapter headings may show no particular relevance to the research.
Credit	65-74%	Broad context present Specific logical plan	Research question and plan are presented and include some detail. There is enough of a plan to believe that the research project is feasible, and that the student understands the resources and time required. The plan does not appear to be informed by the literature review – it sits largely separately to the literature review, it is not part of the narrative developed in the review. Thesis outline reflects the research plan but lacks sufficient detail.
Distinction	75-84%	Broad context present Specific logical plan Plan fits the review narrative	In addition to the above: The plan fits within the narrative set out by the literature review – the student makes clear why the plan is developed this way in the narrow context of the reviewed literature. The research plan demonstrates a logical and feasible course of action. Realistic milestones have been set. The thesis outline demonstrates a logical vision for the thesis.
High Distinction	85-100%	Broad context present Specific and robust logical plan Plan fits the review narrative	In addition to the above: The plan is robust and has provision for project variations and contingencies. The plan fits within the narrative set out by the literature review – the student makes clear why the plan is developed this way in the context of the reviewed literature. The thesis outline includes sub-sections, logical flow with a clear connection to the project plan and literature review.

Criterion 3: Project Dependent Preparations

Grade	Mark	Brief description	Longer explanation / examples
Fail	0-49%	Insufficient preparations	<p>The report does not provide evidence of the student having undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient training and upskilling in the subject, techniques, software and/or equipment use which is required by the Project Sufficient preparations for the practical execution of the Project (these are project specific, but might in general include ordering of parts, budgeting, approval documents, etc.) Sufficient assessment and countermeasures for key risks of the Project
Pass	50-64%	Limited preparations	All the required preparations (Project specific, see list above for examples, this apply to all grade descriptions) are present but require significant revision in order to proceed with the Project. No significant preliminary results
Credit	65-74%	Solid preparations	All the required preparations are present and do NOT require significant revision (ready to proceed). Very limited or no significant preliminary results.
Distinction	75-84%	Solid preparations and preliminary results/outputs	<p>All the required preparations are present and do NOT require significant revision (ready to proceed).</p> <p>Significant preliminary results are provided, which allow confirming or adjusting the Project plan.</p>
High distinction	85-100%	Solid preparations and exceptional early results/ outputs	<p>All the required preparations are present and do NOT require significant revision (ready to proceed).</p> <p>Exceptional progress already reported in the document, which allows confirming or adjusting the Project plan and already drafting some preliminary answers to the Project's research questions.</p>

Criterion 4: Document Presentation

Grade	Mark	Brief description	Longer explanation / examples
Fail	0-49%	Impedes document reading	Presentation is poor to the extent that it impedes reading of the document. Examples include multiple inconsistent citation styles or incomplete citations, unintelligible grammar, figures or tables not labelled or badly inconsistent document formatting.
Pass	50-64%	Poor formatting / document structure	Document is not at a professional level. Although figures and diagrams are labelled and references in text match reference list (and vice versa), formatting is unclear and inconsistent to the extent that the reader can lose track of the context when reading.
Credit	65-74%	Poor judgement with respect to layout, possible padding	Appropriate use of section and sub-section heading structures, Figures and diagrams are labelled, formatting is consistent, references in text match reference list (and vice versa), pictures are clear and attributed, sections clearly labelled. There may be superfluous material present, such as unnecessary, repetitive or unusually large figures, unnecessarily lengthy text, unusually wide margins, unnecessary appendices, etc.
Distinction	75-84%	Professional, may have issues with data presentation	Everything from above, plus a logical flow of sections, and appropriate judgement in the placement data, tables or figures in the body of the work or the appendices. Figures and diagrams are correctly and clearly labelled, text spacing aids readability, consistent formatting, references in text match reference list (and vice versa), pictures are clear and attributed, sections clearly labelled. Some of the graphical presentation of data is inappropriate - poor choice of axes, overcrowding, poor use of chart space etc.
High Distinction	85-100%	Professional, concise and readable	Everything from above, plus text is clear and concise. Graphical presentation of data is appropriate, clear and economical.