THIRD YEAR PROJECT ASSESSMENT
NOTES FOR GUIDANCE

Your ultimate aim is to allocate an overall numerical mark on the College-wide scale:

$$\text{Fail} < 35\% \leq \text{Ord.} < 40\% \leq \text{III} < 50\% \leq \text{II.2} < 60\% \leq \text{II.1} < 70\% \leq \text{I}$$

To arrive at a mark, follow the guidelines given below. These refer to the criteria listed in the assessment report form.

0-24: Bad Fail The project is inadequate in each of the basic criteria.

25-34: Fail The project is inadequate in more than one of the basic criteria, but not all.

35-39: Ordinary Degree The project is inadequate in exactly one of the basic criteria.

40-49: III The project is adequate on each of the basic criteria.

50-59: II.2 The project is at least average on each of the basic criteria and is average on most of the additional criteria.

60-69: II.1 The project is at least good on each of the basic criteria and is at least average and sometimes good or excellent on each of the additional criteria.

70-79: Low I The project is good or excellent on each of the basic and additional criteria.

80-89: Mid I The project is good or excellent on each of the basic and additional criteria and also has elements of the exceptional criteria.

90-100: High I The project is good or excellent on each of the basic, additional and exceptional criteria.

Many projects will not fit neatly into any category, eg strong on additional criteria, but weak on a basic one. In this case you are asked to trade one criterion off against another as best you can, bearing in mind that failure on a basic criterion is a serious fault.

The project should be assessed on the evidence that these have been demonstrated. The criteria for assessing this are given in the assessment report form and are divided into basic, additional and exceptional.

Supervisors should assess the project on the basis of evidence provided both in the written dissertation and in your regular meetings. If you are aware of any mitigating factors which should be taken into account, please do not compensate for them in your assessment, but mention them in the appropriate section in your report and indicate the degree of compensation you feel would be appropriate. If you feel that the dissertation does not do justice to the work carried out by the student, please make this clear in your report together with an explanation. Supervisors should also note the extent to which the student was self-directed or else required close supervision.

THIRD YEAR PROJECT ASSESSMENT REPORT

Student Name: _____

Project Title: _____

Supervisor: _____

Mark: _____ %

_____

INSTRUCTIONS

Having read the notes for guidance; comment on the dissertation under each of the following criteria, and assign a mark on the following scale:

0: not applicable,　　1: inadequate,　　2: adequate,　　3: average,　　4: good,　　5: excellent.

BASIC CRITERIA	0	1	2	3	4	5
A. Explanation of the project	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
B. Completion† of the project	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
C. Quality of the Software	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
D. Quality of the dissertation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
E. Attendance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

ADDITIONAL CRITERIA	0	1	2	3	4	5
F. Knowledge of the area and background	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
G. Critical evaluation of own work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
H. Justification of the design decisions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

EXCEPTIONAL CRITERIA	0	1	2	3	4	5
I. Evidence of Ingenuity	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
J. Critical evaluation of previous work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

K. Contains publishable material?　　**Yes/No**　　(circle one)

---

† Note that "completion" covers achievement of the original objectives, achievement of modified objectives or providing convincing evidence that the objectives are unachievable.

COMMENTS

FINAL MARK:

PANEL CHAIR SIGNATURE: