

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, all correct					
Description of Problem to be solved	3	No Description	Minimal description of the problem. Maybe no explanation of significance/interest of the problem. Maybe no attempt to explain how the project will attempt to address 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 sufficient for a clear understanding	Excellent description and justification of the problem and how (in broad terms) the GRP will address it.	Perfect description of the GRP project's target problem. Contextualised with clear explanation of the gap in literature/application, and how the GRP project will fill this gap.		
Background Information & Research	10	No knowledge of the subject area and topic. No motivation provided.	A limited knowledge of the subject area with no appreciation of context or motivation. Knowledge of the topic is at a superficial level. E.g., very limited and inappropriate review of similar previous work or literature review or inclusion of statements as word- by-word proper quotations from sources (else is plagiarism) with no value added.	Knowledge of the subject area is mostly relevant (but some could be irrelevant) to the project, with some appreciation of the context and motivation. There is some knowledge of the topic and it has been connected to the project up to a degree. E.g., good literature review of the immediate project background with some good examples of research/(industrial) applications.	Knowledge of the subject area is fully relevant to the project, with appreciation of context and motivation. There is some knowledge of the topic which has been well connected to the project. E.g., sound (literature) review of the project area, with awareness of research/applications and relevance.	Knowledge of the subject area is fully relevant to the project, with a full, excellent appreciation of context and motivation. There is depth of knowledge of the topic, key work is identified and it has been explicitly connected to the project. E.g., extensive (literature) review of the field and excellent awareness of research/(industrial) applications and relevance.				
Requirements Specification (agreed between Team and Supervisor)	10	No Requirements Specification included	Minimal description of the requirements. Maybe vague. Maybe incorrect. Maybe lacking appropriate presentation/formulation. Maybe lacking distinct functional/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.	Essentially acceptable, and correct, broad description of the requirements. Maybe missing details. Maybe lacking some subtle functional/non-functional requirements. Enough detail for an SE to begin.	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)	Perfect description of the project's requirements, with clear and verifiable requirements, both functional and non-functional. No missing or misrepresented requirements		
(Initial) Design	10	No Design (or explanation/justification for none) included	Some attempt at articulating design. Maybe without justification. Maybe without any meaningful diagrams. 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.	Perfect design, including the appropriate UML (or other) diagrams, explanation and justification. Clearly connected to the Requirements.		
(Initial) User Interface (UI)	5	No UI (or explanation/justification for none) included	Some discussion related to UI, but no clear design or explanation. Maybe no diagrams. Maybe no clear presentation 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 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, with perfect explanation, justification.		

100