Project Report Marking Guidance

Marking descriptors are provided to staff and students as guidance. The mark descriptors capture essential elements of projects at different levels but do not intended to be exhaustive. Academic judgement must always be exercised when evaluating project work. The School of Computer Science employs robust inspection, second marking and moderation processes.

80-100 — Outstanding

Problem Definition: Exceptionally clear and rigorous articulation of a significant technical problem, with thorough comparisons to state-of-the-art approaches or existing systems.

Methodology: Use of rigorous and appropriate methods to address the problem, demonstrating exceptional analytical ability and astute decision making.

Design and Implementation: Systematic, accurate, and robust implementation, potentially featuring novel or innovative aspects.

Evaluation: Comprehensive and robust evaluation with critical analysis, supported by solid evidence and clear metrics.

Report Quality: Systematic, well-structured, and professionally presented report with exceptional clarity and accuracy. Excellent use of relevant academic literature.

70-79 — Excellent

Problem Definition: Clearly defined problem, building on and extending material from other modules, with solid comparisons to existing work.

Methodology: Deep understanding of Computer Science concepts and scientific or engineering methods.

Design and Implementation: Accurate and mostly robust implementation, with well-justified design choices and comprehensive testing.

Evaluation: Evidence-based critical analysis of the project's success, using appropriate methodologies and metrics.

Report Quality: Well-structured, clear, and professionally presented report. Solid use of relevant academic literature, perhaps with some errors.

60-69 — Very Good

Problem Definition: Significant problem relevant to Computer Science, motivated by module content or research topics.

Methodology: Use of sound critical thinking and substantial scientific or engineering methods typical of an undergraduate degree.

Design and Implementation: Accurate implementation with some minor errors or omissions, but which has some notable strengths.

Evaluation: Rigorous evaluation based on a sound methodology and reproducible results.

Report Quality: Sufficiently detailed report enabling repeatability of the work.

50-59 — Good

Problem Definition: Well-defined problem with some conceptual errors or omissions.

Methodology: Appropriate use of scientific or engineering methods, but with one or two significant errors.

Design and Implementation: Reasonable implementation but key parts are not rigorous.

Evaluation: Evaluation may lack substance or be based on opinion rather than evidence.

Report Quality: Clear report but may lack some details necessary for full reproducibility.

40-49 — Undergraduate Pass but M-level FAIL

Problem Definition: Problem specification may be anecdotal or superficial, lacking depth and intellectual challenge.

Methodology: Basic use of scientific or engineering methods with major errors or significant omissions.

Design and Implementation: Basic programming or software skills demonstrated; software may be buggy or incomplete.

Evaluation: Informal or weak evaluation, potentially based on anecdotal evidence.

Report Quality: Report may be unclear, poorly structured, or lack significant details.

30-39 — Undergraduate and M-level FAIL

Problem Definition: Insufficiently substantial problem, lacking depth and clarity.

Methodology: Insufficiently rigorous methods, with substantial errors throughout the work.

Design and Implementation: Incomplete or substantially flawed implementation.

Evaluation: Weak or non-existent evaluation, lacking rigour and evidence.

Report Quality: Poorly presented report with significant missing or unclear sections.

0-29 — INCOMPLETE

Problem Definition: Little to no evidence of substantial problem specification.

Methodology: Inability to solve problems using scientific and engineering methods.

Design and Implementation: Severely incomplete or erroneous implementation.

Evaluation: Little to no evaluation present.

Report Quality: Incomplete report with major omissions and lack of clarity.