<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCL Computer Science: Marking Criteria and Grade Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fail</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the response to the task set: answer, structure and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 40: BSc: Fail MEng: Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49: BSc: 3rd MEng: Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass (2:2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass (2:2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit (2:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction (1st)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction (1st)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Quality of the response to the task set: answer, structure and conclusions**
   - Inadequate
     - Either no argument or argument presented is inappropriate and irrelevant. Conclusions absent or irrelevant.
   - Satisfactory
     - A reasonable response with a limited sense of argument and partial conclusions.
   - Good
     - A sound response with a reasonable argument and straightforward conclusions, logical conclusions.
2. **Understanding of relevant issues**
   - Inadequate
     - Misunderstanding of the issues under discussion.
   - Satisfactory
     - Rudimentary, intermittent grasp of issues with confusions.
   - Good
     - Reasonable grasp of the issues and their broader implications.
3. **Engagement with related work, literature and earlier solutions**
   - Inadequate
     - Very limited or irrelevant reading.
   - Satisfactory
     - Significant omissions in understanding of literature consulted.
   - Good
     - Evidence of relevant reading and some understanding of literature consulted.
4. **Analysis: reflection, discussion, limitations**
   - Inadequate
     - Errorneous analysis. Misunderstanding of the basic core of the taught materials. No conceptual material.
   - Satisfactory
     - Analysis relying on the partial reproduction of ideas from taught materials. Some concepts absent or wrongly used.
   - Good
     - Reasonable reproduction of ideas from taught materials. Rudimentary definition and use of concepts.
5. **Algorithms and/or technical solution**
   - Inadequate
     - No solution to the given problem, completely incorrect code for the given task.
   - Satisfactory
     - Rudimentary algorithmic/technical solution, but mostly incomplete.
   - Good
     - Reasonable solution, using basic required concepts, several flaws in implementation.
6. **Testing of solution (e.g., correctness, performance, evaluation)**
   - Inadequate
     - No testing or evaluation done.
   - Satisfactory
     - Basic testing done, but important test cases or parts of evaluation missing or incomplete.
   - Good
     - Solid testing or evaluation of solution, well done evaluation with good summary of findings.
7. **Oral presentation or demonstration of solution**
   - Inadequate
     - Poorly presented, presentation or demo of the solution.
   - Satisfactory
     - Able to communicate present and/or demonstrate solution and summarise work in appropriate format.
   - Good
     - Style and word choice show fluency with ideas and excellent communication skills.
8. **Writing, communication and documentation**
   - Inadequate
     - Poorly formatted, inappropriate visuals, and incorrect reference formatting.
   - Satisfactory
     - Formatting, visuals and referencing seriously distract from argument.
   - Good
     - Formatting, visuals and referencing are impeccable.
9. **Formatting aspects, visuals, clarity, references**
   - Inadequate
     - Formatting, visuals and referencing seriously distract from argument.
   - Satisfactory
     - Formatting well-done and consistent, good visuals and consistent referencing.