

COMP5200M MSc Project

Marking Guidance & Rubric

On completion of this module, students should be able to:

- demonstrate an in-depth comprehension of the topics/issues relevant to the project;
- select and apply the appropriate methods for their chosen project area;
- demonstrate independent application of the knowledge, methods and techniques that have been acquired during the MSc programme in producing a solution in the project;
- demonstrate skills in project management and presentation;
- produce a critical evaluation of the outcome of the project;
- demonstrate proficiency in written communications;
- understand how to make use of a wide range of information sources.

English proficiency (Pass/Fail)

You must demonstrate a threshold level of English proficiency in order to be awarded a Grade. Failure to meet this threshold will result in a grade of 0. The threshold requires,

- Paragraphs are used
- There are links between and within paragraphs although these may be ineffective at times
- There are attempts at referencing
- Word choice and grammar do not seriously undermine the meaning and comprehensibility of the argument
- Word choice and grammar are generally appropriate to an academic text

Feedback on the English proficiency will be provided if you fail to meet the minimum standard.

Breakdown of the project's marks

The 100 marks of the MSc project are divided amongst a number of assessment criteria as in the following tables:

Problem statement (12 marks)

Class (Level of Achievement)	Descriptor
High Distinction (outstanding) (10-12 marks)	An excellent articulation of the scope, aims and objectives, providing solid evidence supporting

	the need for the project and accessible to a non-specialist, with aim(s) articulated with respect to the wider project area and meaningful objectives supporting the aim.
Distinction (Excellent) (9 marks)	A very good articulation of the scope, aims and objectives, providing clear evidence supporting the need for the project, aim(s) articulated well with respect to the wider project area and meaningful objectives supporting the aim.
Merit (Good) (8 marks)	A good articulation of the project scope, aims and objectives, with aim(s) articulated with respect to the wider project area and objectives supporting the aim
Pass (Sufficient) (6-7 marks)	Sufficient description of the project scope and wider area; with aim(s) articulated sufficiently and objectives supporting the aims
Fail (Insufficient) (5 marks)	Poor articulation of the project scope, with unclear aims and objectives
No serious attempt (0-4 marks)	The section is missing from the report or there is no clear intention to communicate a problem statement.

Background Research (15 marks)

Class (Level of Achievement)	Descriptor
High Distinction (outstanding) (12-15 marks)	Excellent selection and evaluation of the relevant literature with extensive critical analysis, going well beyond a description of existing work. Demonstrating exceptional background reading, and conceptual understanding of the state-of-the-art enabling the student to comment upon particular aspects of current research.
Distinction (Excellent) (11 marks)	Very good selection and evaluation of the relevant literature with very good critical analysis, going well beyond a description of existing work. Demonstrating extensive background reading, and understanding of the state-of-the-art or challenges.
Merit (Good) (9-10 marks)	Good selection and evaluation of the relevant literature with good critical analysis, going beyond the description of existing work. Touching upon the state-of the art.
Pass (Sufficient) (8 marks)	Fair selection and evaluation of the relevant literature with some critical analysis but mostly descriptive.
Fail (Insufficient) (6-7 marks)	Little articulation of the literature with mostly descriptive analysis, with critical analysis or relevance lacking.

No serious attempt (0-5 marks)	The section is missing or selects inappropriate articles for review.
-----------------------------------	--

Design/Framework (15 marks)

Class (Level of Achievement)	Descriptor
High Distinction (outstanding) (12-15 marks)	<p>The hypothesis is elaborated and is discussed in detail. The design is well informed by the requirements of the problem and is suitable to be published in a discipline specific peer reviewed outlet.</p> <p>The requirements are explicitly stated and are linked to the problem statement. The design takes into consideration Legal, Social and professional issues related to the topic.</p> <p>The project was conducted with a reasonable degree of autonomy and the student collaborated as peers with academics.</p>
Distinction (Excellent) (11 marks)	<p>The hypothesis is elaborated and is discussed in detail. The design is well informed by the requirements of the problem.</p> <p>Design decisions are explored to a sufficient level of detail. The design takes into consideration Legal, Social and professional issues related to the topic.</p> <p>The project was conducted with a reasonable degree of autonomy and made good use of academics as domain experts.</p>
Merit (Good) (9-10 marks)	<p>The hypothesis is explored to a reasonable level of detail but does not demonstrate a wider understanding of context or existing work.</p> <p>The design is informed by the requirements of the problem.</p> <p>The project was conducted with a reasonable degree of autonomy.</p>
Pass (Sufficient) (8 marks)	A valid design is presented which addresses the problem. Design decisions are justified and explicit.

	<p>Requirements have been extracted using an appropriate technique.</p> <p>Appropriate data sets/variables are identified for exploration.</p>
Fail (Insufficient) (6-7 marks)	<p>A design is presented which takes into account stated requirements.</p> <p>The requirements elicitation is omitted or fundamentally flawed.</p>
No serious attempt (0-5 marks)	<p>The section is missing or omits essential design considerations.</p>

Implementation (30 marks)

Class (Level of Achievement)	Descriptor
High Distinction (outstanding) (24-30 marks)	<p>Arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data critically evaluated, to make judgements and frame appropriate questions – some of which at the forefront of discipline – to identify and implement a working solution. Project aim and all objectives originally set out for the project fully achieved.</p> <p>The implementation would stand up to peer review in a suitable discipline specific outlet, and adopts the open science ethos.</p> <p>The project was conducted with a reasonable degree of autonomy and the student collaborated as peers with academics.</p>
Distinction (Excellent) (21-23 marks)	<p>Arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data critically evaluated, to make judgements and frame appropriate questions; to achieve a good solution implement a functioning prototype. Project aim and all objectives achieved to a very good extent.</p> <p>The project was conducted with a reasonable degree of autonomy and made good use of academics as domain experts.</p>
Merit (Good) (18-20 marks)	<p>Arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts well evaluated to make judgements and achieve a good solution. Project aim and most objectives</p>

	<p>originally set out for the project achieved to a good extent.</p> <p>The project was conducted with a reasonable degree of autonomy.</p>
Pass (Sufficient) <i>(15-17 marks)</i>	<p>Arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts sufficiently evaluated to achieve a fair solution to the problem. Project aim and most objectives originally set out for the project fairly achieved.</p>
Fail (Insufficient) <i>(12-14 marks)</i>	<p>Some progress with the project and some technical work delivered, but falling short of the standard required to meet the module learning outcomes. Project aim and objectives not achieved.</p>
No serious attempt <i>(0-11 marks)</i>	<p>Very little technical achievement presented. technical work falls well short of expectations; module learning outcomes have not been met. Project aim and objectives not achieved.</p>

Evaluation (10 marks)

Class (Level of Achievement)	Descriptor
High Distinction (outstanding) <i>(8-10 marks)</i>	<p>There is an appropriate evaluation approach taken which is in line with discipline norms.</p> <p>The evaluation attributes /artifacts exposed by the evaluation are linked to the problem statement, requirements, or experimental technique.</p> <p>The evaluation makes critical comparisons with existing state of the art publications which would stand up to peer review.</p> <p>The project was conducted with a reasonable degree of autonomy and the student collaborated as peers with academics.</p>
Distinction (Excellent) <i>(7 marks)</i>	<p>There is an appropriate evaluation approach taken which is in line with discipline norms.</p> <p>The evaluation attributes/artifacts exposed by the evaluation are linked to the problem</p>

	<p>statement, requirements, or experimental technique.</p> <p>The outcome is contextualized in the current state of the art.</p> <p>The project was conducted with a reasonable degree of autonomy and made good use of academics as domain experts.</p>
<p>Merit (Good)</p> <p><i>(6 marks)</i></p>	<p>There is an appropriate evaluation approach taken which is in line with discipline norms.</p> <p>Critical comments are made which demonstrate strengths/weaknesses of the project topic.</p> <p>The project was conducted with a reasonable degree of autonomy.</p>
<p>Pass (Sufficient)</p> <p><i>(5 marks)</i></p>	<p>There is an appropriate evaluation approach taken which is in line with discipline norms.</p> <p>Some superficial critical comments are made explicit.</p>
<p>Fail (Insufficient)</p> <p><i>(4 marks)</i></p>	<p>An evaluation approach is used which is not appropriate for the topic or overlooks an important aspect.</p>
<p>No serious attempt</p> <p><i>(0-3 marks)</i></p>	<p>The evaluation is missing or make unsubstantiated assertions.</p>

Conclusion & Future Work (6 marks)

Class (Level of Achievement)	Descriptor
<p>High Distinction (outstanding)</p> <p><i>(6 marks)</i></p>	<p>The outcome of the project is summarized and critically framed in the context of the state of the art.</p> <p>Appropriate future work is suggested which shows a solid awareness of the state of the art and the current direction of development. The future work could potentially be written up as a research proposal for future study and contains novelty.</p>

Distinction (Excellent) (5 marks)	<p>The outcome of the project is summarized and critically framed in the context of the state of the art.</p> <p>Appropriate future work is suggested which shows some awareness of the state of the art and the current direction of development.</p>
Merit (Good) (4 marks)	<p>The outcome of the project is summarized and critically framed in the context of the state of the art.</p> <p>The suggested future work is a natural extension of the work presented and aligns with the direction of travel in current research.</p>
Pass (Sufficient) (3 marks)	<p>The outcome of the project is summarized and presented in the context of existing work.</p> <p>The suggested future work is a natural extension of the work presented.</p>
Fail (Insufficient) (2 marks)	<p>The outcome of the project is summarized.</p> <p>The suggested future work follows a broadening of the considered topic (i.e. "more of the same")</p>
No serious attempt (0-1 marks)	This section is missing or demonstrated a lack of awareness of context or direction of travel of potential future work.

Report quality (12 marks)

Class (Level of Achievement)	Descriptor
High Distinction (outstanding) (10-12 marks)	Outstanding presentation, organisation and clarity. Clear, concise and focused academic writing backed up by evidence suitable to be published in a discipline specific peer reviewed outlet. Excellent choice and range of references appropriately cited. A wide range of informative tables and figures of excellent quality.
Distinction (Excellent) (9 marks)	Very well presented and logically organized. Clear, concise and focused academic writing.
Merit (Good) (8 marks)	Clear and focused academic writing. Appropriate references used, mostly listed/cited correctly. Informative figures and tables of high quality

Pass (Sufficient) (6-7 marks)	Level of academic writing is basic but clear. Sufficient references included and cited. A few figures & tables but meaningful and informative.
Fail (Insufficient) (5 marks)	Poor academic writing with minimal clarity. Limited/insufficient referencing.
No serious attempt (0-4 marks)	Poor academic writing with little or no clarity. Very limited/insufficient referencing.