

## 3rd Year Projects Marking Guidelines and Criteria

The 3rd year dissertations are intended to be substantive projects that build upon the knowledge and skills that the students have developed throughout their undergraduate programme.

There are key differentiators between the 3rd year individual projects, compared to the 4th year ones:

- These projects may, but need not, involve research or business-focused development.
- The level of starting specialist knowledge for a given topic is lower (essentially the difference in the taught components of the three and four year courses).
- The projects take place over the entire year of study.

This makes the expected level of attainment, and the related assessment criteria for the 3rd year projects closer to those applied for the MSc projects than for the 4th year undergraduate ones. The marking scale closely mirrors that from the MSc programmes, and is shown below.

<b>3rd Year Project Marking Scale</b>		
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Expected dissertation attributes</b>
1st	100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report demonstrates a significant breakthrough in Computer Science.</li> <li>• If there are any shortcomings, these are overshadowed by the significance of the contribution.</li> </ul>
1st	90-99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project posed significant challenge(s) and most of the approved or equivalently challenging goals were done <u>outstandingly</u>.</li> <li>• The report shows the author has become an expert in the topic.</li> <li>• If there are any shortcomings on the writing, these are overshadowed by the significance of the achievements.</li> <li>• The resulting product, <u>as written by the author alone and as presented in the report</u>, is an example of work similar to those found in a top-quality peer reviewed venue of the relevant topic, and or in essence, is on par with a top CS commercial product.</li> </ul>
1st	70-89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project posed significant challenge(s) and most or significant goals were achieved with excellence.</li> <li>• The report shows the author has excellent awareness of the literature, relevant methods and relevant evaluation procedures.</li> <li>• If there are any shortcomings, e.g. on the writing style these do not overshadow the result.</li> <li>• The finished product is of such quality that it serves as an example of how a thesis should be aimed at.</li> </ul>
2.i	65-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the approved project goals (or equivalently challenging goals) have been achieved.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report shows author has <u>very good</u> grasp of the relevant technical or implementation topics <u>and</u> relevant literature.</li> <li>• There are no serious experimental or procedural shortcomings and if there are, these are minimal and not preventing a solid and thorough product with a good reflection.</li> </ul>
2.i	60-64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the approved project goals (or equivalently challenging goals) have been achieved.</li> <li>• Report shows author has a <u>good</u> grasp of the relevant topics and a good level of technical competence.</li> <li>• Methods and or some elements in the report could have been improved within the timescale of the project, still any shortcomings have not prevented a good conclusion.</li> </ul>
2.ii	50-59	<p>Projects here are typically displaying <b>most</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project has a degree of challenge, it was not a trivial task or the project idea has been panel-approved.</li> <li>• Some of the key project goals have been achieved.</li> <li>• The report shows that the author grasps the basic literature, basic topic's concepts and relevant to the topic implementation and or experimental procedures.</li> <li>• Experiments and Implementation could have been improved within the project timescale and it is clear how this would have been done if extended literature had been consulted.</li> <li>• Any shortcomings do not prevent a clear although perhaps basic conclusion. And conclusions are supported by the approach taken.</li> </ul>
3rd	40-49	<p>Projects here are typically displaying <b>one or several of</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A <u>seriously</u> questionable or significantly lacking evaluation method or procedure has been used but if changed the project would have been passable.</li> <li>• There is <u>significant</u> missing evaluation to support the claims of the approved or similarly challenging project goals and/or it is difficult to verify that the practical work completed matches the written or verbal description in the thesis.</li> <li>• <u>Apart from one of the above</u>, the literature review has serious missing elements and author appears unaware of or has misunderstood the key work in the area which would have changed conclusions and or methodology.</li> <li>• If the project is mainly a review, the review is seriously lacking depth and breadth and conclusions reached are unsupported.</li> </ul>
Fail	0-39	<p>Projects here typically display <b>most</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basically no challenging goals have been achieved.</li> <li>• There is <u>little to no evidence</u> that the author is aware of the relevant literature.</li> <li>• Report <u>significantly</u> lacks in most of the expected thesis components: literature review, evaluation and or implementation.</li> <li>• Writing style is of such low quality that prevents understanding of results, methods and or conclusions.</li> </ul>