

Guidelines for Marking Projects

Projects are measured against criteria on a five point scale: inadequate, adequate, satisfactory, good, excellent. These then map to the following mark ranges:

Mark Ranges

- 0-29 Project is inadequate in all threshold criteria
- 30-39 Project is inadequate in more than one but not all threshold criteria
- 40-49 Project is inadequate in one of the threshold criteria
- 50-54 Project is adequate on the threshold criteria
- 55-59 Project is at least satisfactory on all threshold criteria and at least satisfactory on most additional criteria
- 60-64 Project is at least good in most threshold criteria and at least satisfactory on all additional criteria
- 65-69 Project is at least good on all threshold and additional criteria
- 70-79 Project is at least good on all threshold and additional criteria and also has elements of the exception criteria
- 80-89 Project is excellent all threshold and additional criteria and at least good on exceptional criteria
- 90-100 Project is excellent on all criteria

Threshold Criteria

1. Understanding of the Problem
2. Software Engineering Process
3. Achievement of objectives
4. Structure, completeness and readability of dissertation

Additional Criteria

1. Knowledge of relevant literature
2. Evaluation of relevant background work
3. Evaluation of own work
4. Justification of design decisions
5. Solution of conceptual difficulties
6. Achievement of objectives
7. Software quality
8. Scope and difficulty of project

Exceptional Criteria

1. Originality of concept, design or analysis
2. Adventure
3. Inclusion of publishable or near publishable material

Typical Characterisation of Project Marks

90-100

Introduction: Defines the project area and its place within the subject. The introduction proceeds from the wider concerns of Computing Science to the specific subject of the report by way of an orderly and natural progression of ideas.

Review: Reviews the background to the project comprehensively, incorporates relevant issues succinctly, omits the irrelevant. Uses the review to identify all the main issues, which are then analysed and developed. The review is a penetrating analysis showing an impressive grasp of the subject and excellent judgement in the selection of previous work that should be applied in the project; it gives new insights into the project area not immediately identifiable from the literature.

Design: From the review, explains the rationale behind the design of the work done, comparing all alternative designs and justifying the particular choices made. Describes the work done succinctly, but in enough detail for the reader to appreciate all the significant points. There is something distinctly ambitious about what has been attempted and the student has carried off the attempt with style, rarely defeated by problems encountered and more typically finding some clever solution.

Evaluation: Evaluates the artefact, comparing results expected from the theory (including those for alternative designs) with those obtained in practice.

Conclusion: States clear conclusions from the work done, making accurate predictions of results that would be obtained by applying the present work in new areas.

80-89

Introduction: Defines the project area and its place within the subject. The introduction proceeds from the wider concerns of Computing Science to the specific subject of the report by way of an orderly and natural progression of ideas

Review: Reviews the background to the project comprehensively, incorporates relevant issues succinctly, omits the irrelevant. Uses the review to identify all the main issues, which are then analysed and developed. The review is a penetrating analysis showing an impressive grasp of the subject and excellent judgement in the selection of previous work that should be applied in the project; it gives new insights into the project area not immediately identifiable from the literature.

Design: From the review, explains the rationale behind the design of the work done, comparing all alternative designs and justifying the particular choices made. Describes the work done succinctly, but in enough detail for the reader to appreciate all the significant points. There is something distinctly ambitious about what has been attempted and the student has carried off the attempt with style, rarely defeated by problems encountered and more typically finding some clever solution.

Evaluation: Evaluates the artefact, comparing results expected from the theory with those obtained in practice.

Conclusion: States clear conclusions from the work done, making accurate predictions of results that would be obtained by applying the present work in new areas.

70-79

Introduction: Defines the project area.

Review: Reviews the background to the project comprehensively, incorporates relevant issues succinctly, omits the irrelevant. Uses the review to identify all the main issues, which are then analysed and developed.

Design: From the review, explains the rationale behind the design of the work done, comparing all alternative designs and justifying the particular choices made. Describes the work done succinctly, but in enough detail for the reader to appreciate the significant points. There is something distinctly ambitious about what has been attempted and the student has carried off the attempt with style, rarely defeated by problems encountered and more typically finding some clever solution.

Evaluation: Evaluates the artefact, comparing results expected from the theory with those obtained in practice.

Conclusion: States clear conclusions from the work done, identifying related problem areas to which the work may be applied.

65-69

Introduction: Defines the project area.

Review: Reviews the background to the project, incorporates relevant issues. Uses the review to identify all the main issues, most of which are then analysed.

Design: From the review, explains the rationale behind the design of the work done, comparing some of the alternative designs and justifying the particular choices made. Describes the work done in enough detail for the reader to appreciate the significant points. This part of the report reveals more than mere competence in the application of standard knowledge; there is a satisfying quality and thoroughness about the work and it is free from any significant

Evaluation: Evaluates the artefact, comparing results expected from the theory with those obtained in practice.

Conclusion: States most of the conclusions that can reasonably be drawn from the work done.

60-64

Introduction: Defines the project area.

Review: Reviews the background to the project, incorporates some relevant issues. Identifies the main issues, most of which are then analysed.

Design: Explains the rationale behind the design of the work done, comparing some of the alternative designs and justifying the particular choices made. Describes the work done in enough detail for the reader to appreciate significant points. Gives a convincing account of how the relevant problems were mostly solved and how some of the unexpected difficulties were resolved to obtain a worthwhile overall result.

Evaluation: Evaluates the artefact, comparing results expected from the theory with those obtained in practice.

Conclusion: States some conclusions from the work done.

55-59

Introduction: Defines the project area.

Review: Reviews the background to the project. Identifies the main issues, some of which are then analysed.

Design: Explains the rationale behind the design of the work done, comparing some of the alternative designs. Describes the work that has been done in enough detail for the reader to appreciate significant points. Gives a convincing account of how the relevant problems were mostly solved and how some of the unexpected difficulties were resolved to obtain a worthwhile overall result.

Evaluation: Evaluates the artefact.

Conclusion: States some conclusions from the work done.

50-54

Introduction: Defines the project area.

Review: Reviews the background to the project; the review is roughly right in what it says but has little to show that the writer really understands the subject.

Design: Lists some design issues, most of which are relevant to the project. Reports that the student has done more or less what was intended, but has also abandoned some of their aims when faced with unexpected problems so that the final result is rather modest. The reports discusses very little above the 'nuts and bolts' level and even there it lacks proportion.

Evaluation: Evaluates the artefact.

Conclusion: States some conclusions from the work done.

40-49

Introduction: Defines the project area.

Review: Lists some issues, some of which are relevant to the project

Design: Describes the work done. It is likely that any artefact is fully developed, but that the original aims of the project are unfulfilled.

Evaluation:

Conclusion: States some conclusions from the work done.

30-39

Introduction: Defines the project area.

Review: Lists some issues, few of which are relevant to the project

Design: Describes some aspects of the work done, though it is possible that any artefact might not be fully developed and the description might be incomplete.

Evaluation:

Conclusion: States some conclusions from the work done.

0-29

Introduction: States some aspects of the project area.

Review:

Design: States some aspects of the work done, but any artefact will not have been fully developed.

Evaluation:

Conclusion: