

1-19: Misunderstanding of assignment or similar
 20-29: 5 inadequate
 30-34: 4 inadequate
 34-39: 3 inadequate

1	Quality of the response to the task set: answer, structure and conclusions
2	Understanding of relevant issues
3	Engagement with related work, literature and earlier solutions
4	Analysis: reflection, discussion, limitations
5	Algorithms and/or technical solution
6	Testing of solution (e.g., correctness, performance, evaluation)
7	Oral presentation or demonstration of solution
8	Writing, communication and documentation
9	Formatting aspects, visuals, clarity, references

Fail	
Inadequate	Weak
Below 40: BSc: Fail MEng: Fail	40-49: BSc: 3rd MEng: Fail
Either no argument or argument presented is inappropriate and irrelevant. Conclusions absent or irrelevant.	An indirect response to the task set, towards a relevant argument and conclusions.
Misunderstanding of the issues under discussion.	Rudimentary, intermittent grasp of issues with confusions.
Very limited or irrelevant reading.	Significant omissions in reading with weak understanding of literature consulted.
Erroneous analysis. Misunderstanding of the basic core of the taught materials. No conceptual material.	Analysis relying on the partial reproduction of ideas from taught materials. Some concepts absent or wrongly used.
No solution to the given problem, completely incorrect code for the given task.	Rudimentary algorithmic/technical solution, but mostly incomplete.
No testing or evaluation done.	Few test cases and/or evaluation, but weak execution.
Poorly done presentation or demonstration, very low quality.	Ineffective oral presentation or demo of the solution.
Style and word choice seriously interfere with comprehension.	Style and word choice seriously detract from conveying of ideas.
Poorly formatted, inappropriate visuals, and incorrect reference formatting.	Formatting, visuals and referencing seriously distract from argument.

Pass (2:2)	
Satisfactory	
50-54: Low pass	55-59: High pass
A reasonable response with a limited sense of argument and partial conclusions.	
Reasonable grasp of the issues and their broader implications.	
Evidence of relevant reading and some understanding of literature consulted.	
Reasonable reproduction of ideas from taught materials. Rudimentary definition and use of concepts.	
Reasonable solution, using basic required concepts, several flaws in implementation.	
Basic testing done, but important test cases or parts of evaluation missing or incomplete.	
Able to communicate, present and/or demonstrate solution and summarise work in appropriate format.	
Style and word choice sometimes detract from conveying of ideas.	
Formatting, visuals and referencing sometimes distract from argument.	

Merit (2:1)	
Good	
60-64: Low merit	65-69: High merit
A sound response with a reasonable argument and straightforward conclusions, logical conclusions.	
Sound understanding of issues, with insights into broader implications.	
Evidence of plentiful relevant reading and sound understanding of literature consulted.	
Evidence of student's own analysis. Concepts defined and used systematically/ effectively.	
Good solution, skilled use of concepts, mostly correct and only minor faults.	
Solid testing or evaluation of solution, well done evaluation with good summary of findings.	
Overall good presentation or demo, persuasive and compelling.	
Style and word choice work well to convey most important ideas. Well documented.	
Formatting well-done and consistent, good visuals and consistent referencing.	

Distinction (1 st)		
Excellent	Outstanding	Exceptional
70-79	80-89	90+
A distinctive response that develops a clear argument and sensible conclusions, with evidence of nuance.	◆-----◆	Exceptional response with a convincing, sophisticated argument with precise conclusions.
Thorough grasp of issues; some sophisticated insights.	◆-----◆	Exceptional grasp of complexities and significance of issues.
Extensive reading and thorough understanding of literature consulted. Excellent critical analysis of literature.	◆-----◆	Expert-level review and innovative synthesis (to a standard of academic publications).
Evidence of innovative analysis. Concepts deftly defined and used with some sense of theoretical context.	◆-----◆	Exceptional thought and awareness of relevant issues. Sophisticated sense of conceptual framework in context.
Excellent algorithmic solution, novel and creative approach.	◆-----◆	Exceptional solution and advanced algorithm/technical design.
Very well done test cases, excellent evaluation and very high quality summary of findings.	◆-----◆	Exceptionally comprehensive testing, extremely thorough approach to testing and/or evaluation.
Very high quality of delivery. Use of presentation medium with professional style.	◆-----◆	Flawless and polished presentation, exceptional quality of demonstration.
Style and word choice show fluency with ideas and excellent communication skills.	◆-----◆	Reads as if professionally copy edited. Exceptional high quality of writing.
Formatting, visuals and referencing are impeccable.	◆-----◆	Exceptional presentation, impeccable formatting of the document and references.