Thesis C overall contributes 70% to the overall Thesis Mark.

Thesis C Report Marking (out of 100) - contributes 90% to the overall Thesis C Mark

Grade	Background and putting the results in context (20%)	Execution of the research project, quality of analysis, discussion of results (50%)	Conclusions, and value added (20%)	Document presentation (10%)
FL (0-49%)	The student has not done a good job explaining the research aims to the reader. Not really sure what this is about.	Work at this level is clearly deficient in not addressing the stated project aims or in containing major problems that the student should reasonably have been aware of but did not address in the thesis.	There are obvious and substantial problems with what was presented – the work as it stands has no value because it doesn't "hold water".	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.
PS (50-64%)	I understand the project aims but the student has not made it clear to the reader how it is connected to the background why is this aim being pursued? What is the hypothesis being tested? What is the broader significance?	A completed body of work and some results, but not succeeded in interpreting meaning from them (intellectual input is largely absent from the discussion). Performance at this level may also indicate a lack of engagement with the project, sometimes evidenced as a "thin" or "one-dimensional" work characterised by attempted padding.	The presented work is not at all challenging and yields entirely expected results – the student does not appear to appreciate this. The work doesn't really add any significant value.	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. The structure of the document is poor or illogical, with little discernible flow.
CR (65-74%)	The student makes the project background clear to the reader, and the significance of the research aim within a broader context. The student has not been able to take a step back and make an assessment of the significance of their results.	The student probably has a number of components to their research, such as literature, experiments, designs, simulations etc. They have interpreted meaning from the results but have overall not succeeded in linking the components of their research together as a coherent scientific story. There's no clear "big picture".	The work adds some value in some way – improvement of "local knowledge" such as techniques, additional data points in a larger design or hypothesis etc. The student worked well but did not make new discoveries or interpretations, therefore the conclusions are limited, and discussions of future work are predictable extensions of the work completed.	Document is not at a professional level. Figures, diagrams and sections are labelled, formatting is consistent, references are properly listed and cited. An attempt might have been made to "pad" the work using unnecessary, repetitive, or large figures, wide margins, etc. The language is not sophisticated or sufficient for describing the technical aspects clearly and rigorously, and there are disjointed aspects to the structure.

Grade	Background and putting the results in context (20%)	Execution of the research project, quality of analysis, discussion of results (50%)	Conclusions, and value added (20%)	Document presentation (10%)
DN (75-84%)	The student makes the project background clear to the reader, and the significance of the research aim within a broader context. The literature review is comprehensive but may be lacking depth of insight. The student has made a reasonable attempt to assess the significance of their results, but it is either not realistic, or does not follow logically from the arguments presented.	At this level the student has assembled the pieces of their research project (which could include literature, different sets of experiments or measurements, simulations or analyses) into a coherent scientific story. Overall, you are left with a clear and convincing picture of what the research question was and what the answer is (along with its caveats) indicating no problems in conceptual or methodological problems with their work.	The results and discussion can eventually form the core of a research publication or change in industry practice (It may have already been included in a conference publication during the course of the thesis). However, further work will first be required – such as repeated experiments – before the work is truly sufficient. The student has included good, thoughtful discussion of limitations and provided insight into future work on this project or new avenues of research which could be followed.	Document is at a professional level. Figures and diagrams, sections are labelled, formatting is consistent, references in text match reference list. and good use made of appendices. Minor issues (e.g., some of the graphical presentation of data is inappropriate poor choice of axes, overcrowding, poor use of chart space etc.) Padding is not a feature of work at this level. The structure is well thought out and logical, and there is a good command of descriptive and technical language – descriptions and explanations have depth but clarity and are concisely worded.
HD (85-100%)	Clear articulation of the significance of the research aim within a broader context, as well as realistic assessment of the outcome. The literature review is comprehensive and insightful.	Student would have to have achieved as at the previous level but additionally has achieved something unexpected, thoughtful and original, such as a novel perspective or theory. This requires deep thinking of the student.	This is valuable work. This work can easily form the basis of a peer-reviewed journal publication, or other form of professional dissemination/presentation appropriate to the field.	Document is at a professional level. No notable issues. The language has fluency, depth and clarity.