SCHOOL OF COMPUTING
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR CSC3094 DISSERTATIONS

Examiners are expected to use the whole of the marking scale and to interpret these criteria in the context of the specific project undertaken. It is important to ensure that feedback justifies the final mark awarded based on these descriptors. Clear explanations should be given for any deviations.

- **Introduction** should introduce the domain of the project, provide a logically structured motivation, describe sound aims and objectives, and justify the structure of the dissertation. Any aspects that have changed significantly since the project proposal should be highlighted and explained.
- **Background review** should cover relevant material relating to the project domain and technologies employed. Sources should be relevant and should be used appropriately (e.g., not over-relying on weak sources). Value should be added by placing the sources in the context of the wider literature and showing their relevance to the project.
- **What was done and how** covers the technical quality of work undertaken and of overall project organization. For the highest grades, the dissertation should demonstrate creative problem solving beyond the student's prior coursework. Any ethical considerations should be appropriately reported.
- **Results and Evaluation** concerns the quality of products (e.g., models, designs, code, proofs, etc.), and the process that the student has performed. The criteria focus on using the results as a basis for sound, justified conclusions, e.g., about the satisfaction of functional or nonfunctional requirements.
- **Conclusion** covers the systematic review of achievements against the project objectives (which should be evidence-based and logically argued), and sound suggestions for future work.
- **Form** covers the structure, organization, quality of writing and non-text forms including graphics and listings as well as the provision of bibliographic information, which should use established standards.

Element	Mark range							
	Missing	Fail (0-29)	Border fail (30-39)	Third (40-49)	Lower 2nd (50-59)	Upper 2nd (60-69)	First (70-79)	Outstanding (80-100)
Introduction	No Introduction	Some materials are present but are incomplete or incoherent.	A basic introduction to the subject is provided, but with inadequate consideration of motivation, aim or objectives.	Evidence of consideration of subject area, aim and objectives and structure of the dissertation.	Mainly relevant and accurate introduction to the subject area, including aims and objectives. There may be some errors or omissions.	Sound, accurate introduction to the subject area that forms an argument motivating the aims & objectives.	Sound, accurate introduction to the subject. Motivates aim and objectives coherently and justifies the structure of the dissertation.	Comprehensive, concise, and precise introduction that provides a complete motivation, aims, objectives and structure.

Background review	Little or no background material.	Little use of background sources to form arguments; may lack conclusions.	Some use of background material to form arguments; conclusions very weak.	Some successful use of background material to provide context for the project. Weak conclusions.	Uses background material appropriately to support project context. Evidence of analyzing validity and relevance of sources.	Sound analysis of evidence to form arguments and draw convincing conclusions regarding the project domain and solution technologies chosen.	Well-organized and reasoned evaluation of diverse sources to draw convincing independent conclusions.	Thorough, well-organized, reasoned evaluation of complex and/or diverse sources to draw strong, independent, convincing conclusions.
What was done, and how	Little or no coherent evidence of technical work done.	Content provides little evidence of applying appropriate methods and tools.	Shows little ability to apply appropriate methods and tools correctly within a sound development or research process.	Shows some ability to apply appropriate methods and tools in a defined development or research process. Ethical aspects appropriately reported.	Shows ability to apply appropriate methods and tools in a suitable and defined process, but process may not be fully thought through. Ethical aspects appropriately reported.	Evidence of applying appropriate methods and tools correctly in a justified and well-defined process, with few errors. Ethical aspects appropriately reported.	Evidence of applying appropriate methods and tools correctly in a justified and well-defined process, with the ability to deliver innovative solutions. Ethical aspects appropriately reported.	Evidence of applying appropriate methods and tools correctly in a justified and well-defined, producing innovative solutions with evidence of understanding strengths and limitations. Ethical aspects appropriately reported.
Results and Evaluation	Little or no indication of results.	Shows very few concrete results; lacks evaluation of results.	Limited description of results; very weak evaluation.	Some description of results and use of evidence to form (possibly weak) evaluation.	Description of results with some use of evidence to perform a broadly sound evaluation with some weaknesses.	Thorough description of results used as evidence in a wholly sound evaluation. May lack evidence of appreciating weaknesses in evaluation.	Thorough description of results used as evidence in a wholly sound evaluation, demonstrating understanding of limitations in evaluation.	Thorough description of results used as evidence in a wholly sound, comprehensive evaluation, showing understanding of limitations in evaluation.

Conclusions	Little or no conclusion.	Very little use of evidence to support conclusions as to progress against objectives.	Little successful use of evidence from the project to support conclusions about progress against objectives.	Some use of evidence from the project to draw weak conclusions on achievements	Use of evidence from the project to draw conclusions on achievements, but these may not be consistently convincing.	Sound analysis of evidence from the project to form arguments and draw convincing conclusions on achievements. Some consideration of possible future work.	Well-structured and reasoned use of evidence to draw sound conclusions on achievements and novel proposals for future work.	Well-structured and reasoned use of diverse evidence to draw sound conclusions on achievements. Convincing and novel proposals for future work.
Form & references	No coherent structure. Referencing inadequate.	Significant omissions in content. Poor structuring and/or substantial language defects make the dissertation difficult to read. Bibliographic details inadequate.	Some content present but inadequately structured. Language defects make the dissertation difficult to read. Some evidence of bibliographic detail, but there may be insufficient detail.	Presentation adequate, though there may be weaknesses in structure. Language defects limit comprehension. Inadequate use of figures, listings, etc. Bibliographic standards followed in the majority of cases.	Well-presented although structure may be unclear. Any language defects do not generally limit comprehension. Some use of figures, listings, etc. where appropriate. Bibliographic standards followed.	Well-presented and structured, few spelling or grammar defects. Appropriate use of well-chosen graphics, listings, etc. Bibliographic standards followed.	Well-presented and structured, very few language defects. Good use of graphics, listings, etc. Concise and clear writing appropriate to the readership. Bibliographic standards wholly followed.	Well-presented, clear structure, very few language defects. Creative use of graphics, listings, etc. Technical writing style and bibliographic detail at professional standard.