

Department of Computer Science University of Bristol MSc Thesis Marking Scale		
Grade	Mark	Expected Features
First- Distinction	100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The report demonstrates a significant breakthrough in Computer Science. If there are any shortcomings, these are overshadowed by the significance of the contribution.
First- Distinction	90-99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project posed significant challenge(s) and most of the approved or equivalently challenging goals were done <u>outstandingly</u>. The report shows the author has become an expert in the topic. If there are any shortcomings on the writing, these are overshadowed by the significance of the achievements. 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.
First-Distinction	70-89	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project posed significant challenge(s) and most or significant goals were achieved with excellence. The report shows the author has excellent awareness of the literature, relevant methods and relevant evaluation procedures. If there are any shortcomings, e.g. on the writing style these do not overshadow the result. The finished product is of such quality that it serves as an example of how a thesis should be aimed at.
Pass-Upper merit	65-69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the approved project goals (or equivalently challenging goals) have been achieved. Report shows author has <u>very good</u> grasp of the relevant technical or implementation topics <u>and</u> relevant literature. 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.
Pass-Merit	60-64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the approved project goals (or equivalently challenging goals) have been achieved. Report shows author has a <u>good</u> grasp of the relevant topics and a good level of technical competence. 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.
Pass	50-59	<p>Projects here are typically displaying <u>most</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has a degree of challenge, it was not a trivial task <u>or</u> the project idea has been panel-approved. Some of the key project goals have been achieved. The report shows that the author grasps the basic

		<p>literature, basic topic's concepts and relevant to the topic implementation and or experimental procedures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Any shortcomings do not prevent a clear although perhaps basic conclusion. And conclusions are supported by the approach taken.
Fail-resubmission expectable	40-49	<p>Projects here are typically displaying <u>one or several</u> of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A <u>seriously</u> questionable or <u>significantly</u> lacking evaluation method or procedure has been used but if changed the project would have been passable. • 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. • <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. • If the project is mainly a review, the review is seriously lacking depth and breadth and conclusions reached are unsupported.
Fail-no resubmission expected	0-39	<p>Projects here typically display <u>most</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basically no challenging goals have been achieved. • There is <u>little to no evidence</u> that the author is aware of the relevant literature. • Report <u>significantly</u> lacks in most of the expected thesis components: literature review, evaluation and or implementation. • Writing style is of such low quality that prevents understanding of results, methods and or conclusions.

Walterio Mayol-Cuevas

18 October 2011