Part II Project: Marking Guidelines

Note to students: It is important to be aware that the marking guidelines given below are *guidelines*, and not a detailed marking rubric. Unlike an exam, where everyone is set the same question and is expected to produce more-or-less the same answer, Part II projects are different for every student. This means that marking necessarily relies upon the informed judgement of the Examiners. For example, in all cases we expect a solid evaluation, but what constitutes good evaluation practices can very quite widely -- consider the different standards needed to evaluate (1) a mechanised correctness proof of an algorithm, (2) an application of machine learning algorithms to a new domain, or (3) a UI/UX redesign aimed at making a piece of software more accessible to blind users. As a result, the guidelines should be treated as a qualitative guide towards writing a good dissertation, and honoring the internal logic of the project should take precedence over ticking all the boxes.

Marks	Percent	Section
		Professional practice and presentation
0-5	0-36%	Write-up is minimal and unclear. Significant difficulty in understanding what has been done. Little evidence that a professional approach has been employed.
6-9	43-64%	Write-up generally clear, with difficulties in some places. Significant errors in terms of planning and professional approach somewhat lacking in terms of project management.
10-14	71-100%	Clear or excellent write-up, with at most a few minor errors. Good or excellent use of diagrams and figures. Professional approach taken across all phases of the project.
		Introduction and Preparation
0-10	0-38%	Poor or missing motivation. Incomplete or missing requirements. Little or no relevant background material presented.
11-17	42-65%	Reasonable motivation. Some discussion on requirements, approach and tools used. Generally clear, relevant background material, with difficulties in places.
18-26	69-100%	Clear motivation, justifying potential benefits of success. Good or excellent requirements analysis; justified and documented selection of suitable tools; good engineering approach. Clear presentation of challenging background material covering a range of computer science topics beyond Part IB.

		Implementation
0-9	0-23%	Substantially incomplete or missing implementation. Minimal discussion on approach, methods or tools. Little software written, hardware built, or analysis conducted.
10-19	25-48%	Actual achievements may be limited or unclear, but a non-trivial deliverable is produced. Awareness of the need to select suitable methods and tools.
20-27	50-68%	Project not particularly ambitious, or not entirely completed. A reasonable deliverable, largely making use of appropriate methods and tools. Minimal or unclear repository overview. Limitations in terms of execution or approach.
28-33	70-83%	Challenging project meeting project success criteria. Appropriate use of mathematical, scientific and/or engineering techniques. Clear repository overview. Some limitations in terms of execution, but basically sound.
34-40	83-100%	Contribution to the field. Application of extra-curricular reading and original interpretation of previous work from academia or industry. Challenging goals and substantial deliverables with excellent selection and application of appropriate mathematical, scientific and/or engineering techniques. Clear and justified repository overview. At most minor faults in execution or understanding.
		Evaluation and Conclusions
0-7	0-35%	Minimal or incomplete evaluation against the success criteria. Limited or incoherent results presented. Conclusions do not provide an effective summary of work completed.
8-14	40-70%	Evaluation against the success criteria, with justification for any areas not completed. Reasonable presentation and interpretation of results which explore the effectiveness of the project. Conclusions provide a summary of work completed.
15-20	75-100%	Clearly presented argument demonstrating success criteria met. Good or excellent evidence of critical thought and interpretation of the results which substantiate any claims of success, improvements or novelty. Conclusions provide an effective summary of work completed along with good future work. Personal reflection on the lessons learned.