Marking Criteria	Weighting	(Zero)	Very Poor (F-2)	Poor (F-1)	Less than adequate (III)	Adequate (II-2)	Good (II-1)	Very Good (I-C)	Excellent (I-B)	Outstanding (I-A)
Front page (including all details, as specified on p.19 of Handbook)	2		Any Mistakes				All details, a	Il correct		
Description of Problem to be solved	3	No Description	significance/interest of the problen	oblem. Maybe no explaination of 1. Maybe no attempt to explain how the the problem. Maybe factual errors.	Better than minimal, but not sufficient description of the problem (or how GRP addresses it) for a reader to understand the importance of the problem/project.	Sufficient description of the problem (or how GRP addresses it) for a reader to understand the importance of the problem/project. Maybe lacking some detail or very clear explanations.	Very good description of problem and how the team's GRP will address it. Maybe lacking some very clear or detailed explanation, but sufficeint for a clear understanding	Excellent description and justification of the problem and how (in broad terms) the GRP will address it.	with clear explanation of the ga	project's target problem. Contextualised up in literature/application, and how the ct will fill this gap.
Background Information & Research	10	No knowledge of the subject area and topic. No motivation provided.	or motivation. Knowledge of the to limited and inappropriate review review or inclusion of statements	t area with no appreciation of context pipe is at a superficial level. E.g., very of similar previous work or literature as word- by-word proper quotations giarism) with no value added.	irrelevant) to the project, with sor motivation. There is some know connected to the project up to a degr immediate project backgroun	mostly relevant (but some could be ne appreciation of the context and ledge of the topic and it has been ee. E.g., good literature review of the d with some good examples of rial) applications.	topic which has been well con-	ion. There is some knowledge of the nected to the project. E.g., sound oject area, with awareness of	full, excellent appreciation of of knowledge of the topic, k explicitly connected to the proj of the field and excellent	a is fully relevant to the project, with a context and motivation. There is depth ey work is identified and it has been ect. E.g., extensive (literature) review awareness of research/(industrial) as and relevance.
Requirements Specification (agreed between Team and Supervisor)	10	No Requirements Specification included	Maybe lacking appropriate pres	nents. Maybe vague. Maybe incorrect entation/formulation. Maybe lacking nal/non-functional.	Almost acceptable. Not (mostly) correct requirements. Missing details Maybe lacking some functional/non-functional requirements. Not enough detail for an SE to begin.	requirements. Maybe missing	A good description of both functional and non-functional requirements.	Excellent description of the projects requirements, with clear and verifiable requirements, both functional and non-functional. Maybe some slight mistakes (missing or unclear requirements)	verifiable requirements, bot	oject's requirements, with clear and h functional and non-functional. No presented requirements
(Initial) Design	10	No Design (or explantion/justification for none) included		n. Maybe without justification. Maybe Not sufficient for an SE to begin work	Still not adequate design, but some OK parts. Has some UML or other diagrams, explanation, justification, but not complete. Or has relatively major mistakes. Maybe not well connected to the Requirements.	More or less adequate design, including the (mostly) appropriate UML or other diagrams, explanation, justification. Connected to the Requirements. Some moderate mistakes or (minor) missing parts OK.	Good design, including the appropriate UML (or other) diagrams, explanation, justification. Connected to the Requirements. Some minor mistakes or (minor) missing parts OK.	Very good design, including the appropriate UML (or other) diagrams, explanation, justification. Connected to the Requirements.		ppropriate UML (or other) diagrams, learly connected to the Requirements.
(Initial) User Interface (UI)	5	No UI (or explantion/justification for none) included		no clear design or explanation. Maybe sentation of how the user will interact	Some attempt to present a UI design, and the implications for the software but lacking detail, or (maybe) including mistakes.	Some UI-related discussion is included, and adequate, but maybe maybe missing some parts. Diagrams or appropriate descriptions are included, but maybe missing some elements.	UI related discussion is included and complete. Diagrams or appropriate descriptions are included. Explanation and presentation are sufficient	Very good presentation of UI, with very good explanation, justification. Some (very) minor issues are OK.	Perfect presentation of UI, w	ith perfect explanation, justification.

Marking Criteria	Weighting	(Zero)	Very Poor (F-2)	Poor (F-1)	Less than adequate (III)	Adequate (II-2)	Good (II-1)	Very Good (I-C)	Excellent (I-B)	Outstanding (I-A)
Record/Discussion of Key Implementation Decisions (OS, Programming Language, Hardware, Software)	10	No Record/Discussion included	Some discussion related to key implementation decisions. Not sufficient. Maybe missing significant parts. Maybe unclear.		Not complete discussion related to key implementation decisions. Almost sufficient, but maybe missing come significant parts. Maybe (somewhat) unclear.	Clear discussion related to implementation decisions. Mostly clear.	Clear listing and discussion of implementation decisions. Clear explanation, justification. Some minor issues are OK.	Very good to excellent listing and discussion of implementation decisions. Ver justification. Some (very) minor issues are OK.		
Results of (Initial) Implementation steps/prototypes	10	None included		quate) discussion related to g. Missing important aspects.	Description of implementation/prototyping to date, is lacking analysis/feedback. Maybe missing some details	OK description of implementation/prototyping to date, with some attempted analysis/feedback. Maybe missing some details	Good description of implementation/prototyping to date, with analysis/feedback. Maybe missing some (relatively minor) details	Very good description of implementation/prototyping to date, with analysis/feedback	implementation or prototype presentation of implementation	progress has been made with the es so far. Perfect descriptions and on prototypes and (where relevant) relevant stakeholders
Discussion of problems encountered (technical, personal, management,)	10	None included	No meaningful listing or analysis. generic probler	ns are explained.	Some project-specific problems are described, but little more (e.g. no/little analysis of cause or remedial action)	Problems related to project are clearly explained. Some reasonably clearly explained follow-up actions/ are articulated	Problems are clearly explained. Follow-up actions are also articulated clearly. Some missing details or actions, but overall, mostly presented.	(including possible cause and action		vell. Clear analysis of the problems I. Remedial action (taken or planned)
Time Plan for the project	5	Nothing related included	, , ,	changes, discussion, or reflection. Or nt a timeline, with obvious probable tws.	A plan, possibly updated from an original. Many obvious problems (e.g. unrealistic times, missing milestones. Little or no reflection on plan	Has reflection on (original) plan. (Can be) an updated version of an earlier version (with explanation). Reflection/inclusion of progress to date and implications for achieving final goal.	A reasonably detailed plan, potentially updated from the original, with explanation. Maybe missing some details. Reasonably (but maybe not 100%) clear, achievable timeline. Reflecion on progress.	A detailed plan, potentially upda	ted from the original, with explar Reflecion on progress.	nation. Clear, achievable timeline.
Quality and usage of sources (in-text citations) to support content/ development of argument	7	No references or citations are used in text.	overuse of Wikipedia and internet sites, although there are better alternatives in terms of books/journals/conference papers, or an inappropriate overreliance on a single source.		Lack of suitable references in the text, suitable references from poor sources. References are overall not used correctly to support report content/ arguments. E.g. inappropriate quoting of references. Little use of in- text citation.	Suitable references are used in the text; The range of references is balanced showing variety of sources (as appropriate for the project books/sournals/web/data sheets); Majority of references are from reputable sources. In-text citations are used correctly to support report content/arguments, as appropriate for a computer science context, e.g. "Smith, 2015 says that structures are great." A few sources in the references are not cited in the text.		A comprehensive range of references are included in the text (books/journals/conference papers/web/data sheets) as appropriate for the project; All references are from reputable sources. In-text-citations are consistently correctly used to support report content/arguments, as appropriate for a computer science context. E.g. "Structures are great (Smith, 2015).". All sources in references are used in the text.		
References/Bibliography list	3	No References		Missing key information. Inconsistent lems (e.g., duplications,)	Some (not all) references are OK. Maybe inconsistent/wrong in formatting. Missing key references, or references in the main text.	maybe some mistakes in formatting. or references in the main text. M	presented using a standard format, Maybe missing some key references, aybe missing some minor details in references.	References are complete and presented using a standard and consistent format. Maybe missing some (in text or area).		identified. References are complete andard and consistent format.
Appendices (including minutes from meetings held to date)	5	No appendices	Some appendices, but poorly considered. Maybe irrelevant. Maybe should have been in the main text. Maybe Meeting minutes not included.		Meeting Minutes included. Minutes included. Other relevant app we				vant and excellent appendices also resented excellently	
Technical writing skills	10	Unreadable report, e.g. due to typos/grammatical errors.	Report is unjustifiable in length either short or long, OR report is at the right length, but structured poorly or difficult to follow due to typos/grammatical errors/etc. in some parts.						d with minor amounts of excess or brevity and report is structured to a using technical language that is consistent in the entire report. There are	
<u> </u>	100	1	·							