



<i>Project Title:</i> _____ <i>Name of student:</i> _____ <i>Degree:</i> _____ <i>Supervisor:</i> _____ <i>Second reader:</i> _____	<b>Result:</b> .../100 =.../120 <b>Agreed mark:</b>
<i>Name of evaluator:</i> _____ <i>Signature:</i> _____ <i>Date:</i> _____	.../100 =.../120

## General comments

<p><b>Project Description:</b> Mention whether the research was part of a larger body of work, such as a group or continuation research, or was carried out in collaboration with industry.</p>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
<p><b>Challenges:</b> What were the major difficulties encountered (technical or other)? Comment on the appropriateness of the solutions, if any, offered. Mention any difficulties you are aware of that may have adversely affected the research in a significant way. Include both difficulties beyond the students control such as equipment unavailability, and other factors in the students work, etc</p>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/>

## Specific Criteria

Problem statement, motivation, and analysis					
Exceptional (80+%)	Very good (70-79%)	Good (60-69%)	Moderately good (50-59%)	Weak (40-40%)	Fail (0-39%)
Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the problem area. The work is clearly motivated, with deep critical analysis of the problem. The project objectives are clearly stated and given an insightful and critical analysis.	Demonstrates a very good understanding of the research problem. The work is very well motivated, with some critical analysis of the problem. The project objectives are clearly stated and analysed.	Demonstrates a reasonably good understanding of the research problem, motivates the work well. The project objectives are clearly stated.	Demonstrates some understanding of the project area, though motivation may be lacking. Objectives may be somewhat unclear, and analysis of the problem may be lacking.	Displays very limited understanding of the project area, with unclear motivation. No, or poor, analysis of the problem with unclear project objectives.	Displays a flawed understanding of the project area. Insufficient analysis of the problem.
Comments					Weight Mark

Background Research & Literature Review					
<p>Exceptional (80+%)</p> <p>Excellent review of the literature demonstrating extensive knowledge of past/current work/authors in the field. Critical and analytical perspective, data collection &amp; analysis. For an undergraduate the report demonstrates an exceptional ability to relate theoretical knowledge to project work.</p>	<p>Very good (70-79%)</p> <p>Work of good quality, demonstrating a sound knowledge of past/current work/authors in the field. Evidence of analysis reaching conclusions of critical and analytical perceptive insight at BA level. Above average ability to relate theoretical knowledge to project work.</p>	<p>Good (60-69%)</p> <p>Work of good quality showing some knowledge of relevant writing in the field. More descriptive than critical/analytical</p>	<p>Moderately good (50-59%)</p> <p>Work showing limited knowledge and appreciation of relevant writing in the field.</p>	<p>Weak (40-40%)</p> <p>Work of poor quality demonstrating scant knowledge on literature expected for this level of study. Does not link with other chapters.</p>	<p>Fail (0-39%)</p> <p>Very superficial knowledge and appreciation of the relevant literature.</p>
Comments					Weight    Mark

Technical content and project execution					
<p>Exceptional (80+%)</p> <p>Comprehensive development of the technical theme, including an element of originality. Appropriate choice of strategy and approach. Limitations recognised. An ambitious project executed well.</p>	<p>Very good (70-79%)</p> <p>Complete development of the technical theme, with at least some novel thinking. Clear and logical design.</p>	<p>Good (60-69%)</p> <p>Sound development of the technical theme. A suitably scoped project executed well, or ambitious project with some weaknesses in execution which are acknowledged.</p>	<p>Moderately good (50-59%)</p> <p>Limited development of the technical theme. Justification and limitations not fully explored.</p>	<p>Weak (40-40%)</p> <p>Sparse development of the technical theme. Poor project design, or poorly executed.</p>	<p>Fail (0-39%)</p> <p>Lack of development of the technical theme, weak execution.</p>
Comments					Weight    Mark

Testing, evaluation, critical analysis & conclusions					
Exceptional (80+%) Work of exceptional quality. Exemplary presentation and analysis of results, evidence of sound critical evaluation. Limitations/future research areas clearly defined.	Very good (70-79%) Work of very good quality. Comprehensive presentation and full analysis of the results. Clear evidence of an ability to critically evaluate.	Good (60-69%) Work of reasonable quality. Clear presentation and relevant analysis of results. Some critical evaluation, perhaps limited in scope.	Moderately good (50-59%) Basic presentation and analysis of results. Demonstrates no originality or critical evaluation.	Weak (40-40%) Confused presentation and incomplete analysis of results. Weak level of technical discussion.	Fail (0-39%) Poor or incomplete presentation of results; inadequate or flawed analysis. Discussion is confused or erroneous.
Comments					Weight    Mark

Report presentation and writing					
Exceptional (80+%) Report is excellently written, coherent, internally consistent, well organized and excellently presented. The report adheres throughout to academic conventions with respect to formatting and referencing and is carefully and effectively presented. Excellent use of figures, tables, and diagrams where appropriate.	Very good (70-79%) The report is logically organised and very well presented. Generally adheres to academic conventions and is overall carefully and effectively presented. Suitable use of figures, diagrams, and tables is made.	Good (60-69%) The report is well organised and presented.	Moderately good (50-59%) Insufficient attention has been paid to the organisation and presentation of the report. Displays some discrepancies in language and academic convention usage. Some use of figures, diagrams, and tables.	Weak (40-40%) A poorly organised and presented report. Writing is of a poor standard. Has a lack of internal consistency. Makes insufficient or incorrect use of figures, diagrams, and tables.	Fail (0-39%) Very poor overall presentation.
Comments					Weight    Mark

This document is discoverable under the terms of the Freedom of Information Act	<b>Totals</b>		%
---	---------------	--	---

\* Default weightings : Problem statement, motivation, and analysis: 10%, Background Research & Literature Review (15%), Technical content and project execution (50%), Testing, evaluation, critical analysis & conclusions (15%), Report presentation and writing (10%)  
Dissertations which take the form of critical literature reviews should have not complete the Background section. Marks and comments for the literature review should be combined with the Technical Content section, and the weighting of the literature review set to 0%