

## **Project thesis (50%)**

**Rationale:** The project thesis is the major means of reporting the contribution of the project. The thesis should be such as to facilitate assessment by persons other than the supervisor, and should comprehensively include material on the problems and goals of the project, applicable methods, the approach taken, major decisions and the reasons for the selection of goals and methods, results, the extent to which the goals have been achieved, the relevance, importance and context of achievements, and the reasons for any shortcomings. Production of the thesis is regarded as part of the educational value of the project, and the supervisor should give guidance where appropriate.

**Delivery:** A copy of the report needs to be submitted electronically to the School by due date published on the course WEB pages. Within seven days of the electronic submission, two printed and bound copies of the thesis and a CD-ROM with the report and supporting files (e.g. software) should be handed in to the school office. The written printed thesis is assessed, but the submission will be incomplete without the other items, leading to a with-held mark. The written thesis is assessed by your supervisor and your assigned examiner against the thesis marking criteria, weighted equally.

All theses should be word processed and printed using a high quality, permanent process (e.g. laser printing). Grammar and spelling should be correct throughout. Figures should be clearly and readily understood. There is no set length of the final thesis, although there is a preferred document standard and method of specifying references. Variations from this should be discussed with the thesis supervisor. The thesis will consist of several chapters, and the length of actual text (excluding title pages, tables of contents, etc) might be several tens up to over a hundred pages. Your thesis supervisor can provide you with good examples of thesis documents. The printed thesis is to be soft-bound with the author's name and the year printed on the spine. This printed copy will be kept by the supervisor (unless they advise you otherwise). The student is responsible for the cost of the printed thesis. The submitted CD-ROM should preferably contain as much information as possible, as logically organised as possible. As a minimum, it should contain all documents you have submitted (progress report, seminar presentation, poster and thesis document), preferably in their native formats. You should also include papers and other sources found as part of your literature review, products produced for your thesis (code, schematics, etc) and all electronic results you have gathered. You are recommended to also produce a copy of this CD-ROM for your own future reference.

### ***Details of assessment***

**Writing and presentation (10%):** The writing should be accurate and coherent with an appropriate attention to detail. On the whole the document should exhibit a clear, logical structure and physical layout. The writing style should be appropriate for a scientific and technical document. The report needs to employ appropriate referencing to a correctly formatted bibliography. The work of others must be appropriately acknowledged. The presentation should be professional, without spelling mistakes or errors of grammar.

**Thesis definition and scope (10%):** A clear definition of a substantial and significant topic, problem and/or hypothesis and the thesis scope should leave the reader with no

doubt about the scope, purpose, relevance, context and contribution of the thesis. The thesis definition and scope should relate to the literature, and show the assumptions (or challenges to assumptions) that have been identified. The scope should require a substantial effort (see Approach and execution below). The abstract should accurately yet concisely capture the thesis topic, employed methods and thesis outcomes.

**Background (20%):** Background material for the thesis should likely include reviews, analyses and discussions of the literature in the area of the thesis and about methods applicable to achieving the thesis goals. This background should not only help the reader understand the rest of the document, but should illustrate to the reader a clear mastery of the material in the topic area and an ability to synthesize and abstract knowledge from other sources.

**Approach and execution (45%):** The thesis should clearly set out the approach of the thesis work as an out-growth of the background research, including an evaluation of alternative approaches. The approach should clearly state the goals of applying methods, how it resolves the stated hypothesis and/or problems, and how the goals will be achieved in a systematic fashion. The approach should show innovation and creativity. The execution of the approach should demonstrate systematic problem solving with balanced theory and practical considerations. You should further demonstrate the ability to respond appropriately to problems that arise during the course of the project. The documentation should highlight your ability to use your knowledge in different contexts, and your ability to acquire and generate new knowledge. The project results are complete and comprehensively presented and analysed. *In general, the execution of the project (as reported in the thesis) should give justice to a substantial work effort.*

**Conclusion (15%):** The results from the work should be analysed in a fashion that highlights your comprehension and shows insight into the significance of the results. The thesis should have a critical review of your performance against the stated plan, including the stated goals and schedule. The thesis should conclude with a clear concise summary of the outcomes of the thesis (relating to your initial definitions and put in context of the literature) and recommendations of how the work might be continued or improved.

Student Name:	Writing and presentation (10%)		Student Number:	Supervisor/examiner:	
Grade Band	Thesis definition and scope (10%)		Background (20%)		
<b>Excellent (85-100%)</b>	10	Excellent logical structure, physical layout and appropriate attention to detail. The work is presented in an accurate, concise and coherent fashion. Scientific and technical style. No spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Appropriate referencing to a correctly formatted bibliography. Appropriately acknowledges the work of others.	10	Extensive, relevant and logically organised review, analysis, discussion of background material, both specific research and general theory, helps the reader understand the rest of the document, and demonstrates clear mastery of the material in the topic area and ability to synthesize and abstract knowledge.	20
	9	Very good logical structure, physical layout and attention to detail. The work is presented in an accurate and coherent fashion. Scientific and technical style. No spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Appropriate referencing to a correctly formatted bibliography. Appropriately acknowledges the work of others.	9		18
<b>Very Good (75-84%)</b>	8	Good structure, physical layout. Some inaccuracies in presentation of work. Neat, occasional spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Occasional errors in referencing. Appropriately acknowledges the work of others.	8	Relevant and logically organised review, analysis, discussion of background material, both specific research and general theory, helps the reader understand the rest of the document, and demonstrates mastery of the material in the topic area and ability to synthesize and abstract knowledge.	16
	8	Acceptable structure and physical layout; Some inaccuracies or lack of detail in presentation of work. Neat, some spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Some errors in referencing or bibliography formatting. Appropriately acknowledges the work of others.	8		15
<b>Good (65-74%)</b>	7	Structure and physical layout detract; many inaccuracies or considerable lack of detail in presentation of work. Numerous spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Several errors in referencing or bibliography formatting. Occasional failures to appropriately acknowledge the work of others.	7	Good review/discussion of background material, with both specific research and general theory, and shows good understanding of the material in the topic area and ability to synthesize and abstract knowledge.	14
	6	Structure and physical layout very poor; presentation of work is inaccurate and incomplete. Numerous spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Several errors in referencing or bibliography formatting. Many failures to appropriately acknowledge the work of others.	6		13
<b>Satisfactory (50-64%)</b>	6	Structure and physical layout detract; many inaccuracies or considerable lack of detail in presentation of work. Numerous spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Several errors in referencing or bibliography formatting. Occasional failures to appropriately acknowledge the work of others.	6	Acceptable coverage of background material, with both specific research and general theory, and shows basic understanding of the material in the topic area.	12
	5	Structure and physical layout very poor; presentation of work is inaccurate and incomplete. Numerous spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Several errors in referencing or bibliography formatting. Many failures to appropriately acknowledge the work of others.	5		11
<b>Poor (25-49%)</b>	4	Structure and physical layout detract; many inaccuracies or considerable lack of detail in presentation of work. Numerous spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Several errors in referencing or bibliography formatting. Occasional failures to appropriately acknowledge the work of others.	4	A limited coverage of background material, which perhaps does not cover both specific research and general theory. Flaws in the basic understanding of the material in the topic area are evident.	10
	3	Structure and physical layout very poor; presentation of work is inaccurate and incomplete. Numerous spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Several errors in referencing or bibliography formatting. Many failures to appropriately acknowledge the work of others.	3		9
<b>Very Poor (0-24%)</b>	2	Structure and physical layout very poor; presentation of work is inaccurate and incomplete. Numerous spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Several errors in referencing or bibliography formatting. Many failures to appropriately acknowledge the work of others.	2	An extremely limited coverage of background material. A lack of understanding of the material in the topic area is clear	7
	1	Structure and physical layout very poor; presentation of work is inaccurate and incomplete. Numerous spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Several errors in referencing or bibliography formatting. Many failures to appropriately acknowledge the work of others.	1		5
	0	Structure and physical layout very poor; presentation of work is inaccurate and incomplete. Numerous spelling mistakes or grammar errors. Several errors in referencing or bibliography formatting. Many failures to appropriately acknowledge the work of others.	0		4

Student Name:	Student Number:		Supervisor/examiner:
<b>Grade Band</b>	<b>Approach end execution (45%)</b>		<b>Conclusion (15%)</b>
<b>Excellent (85-100%)</b>	A clearly set out plan with goals and methods systematically follows from the background research. The approach highlights your creativity and innovation and includes an evaluation of alternative approaches. The execution indicates a substantial work effort, and shows the application of knowledge gained from background research. The project results are complete and comprehensively presented and analysed.	45 42 38	The analysis of the work conducted highlights your comprehension and shows insight into the significance of the results. The thesis has a critical review of your performance against the stated plan. The thesis concludes with a clear concise summary of the outcomes – in context of specified thesis definitions and literature – and brings recommendations for continuation and improvement of the work.
<b>Very Good (75-84%)</b>	A clearly set out plan with goals and methods systematically follows from the background research. The approach shows innovation and includes an evaluation of alternative approaches. The actual execution of work shows the application of knowledge gained from background research and indicates a very good effort. The project results are complete and comprehensively presented and analysed.	37 34	The analysis of the work conducted shows comprehension and some insight into the significance of the results. The thesis has a critical review of the outcomes – in context of specified thesis definitions and literature – and brings recommendations for continuation and improvement of the work.
<b>Good (65-74%)</b>	Good structure, physical layout. Some inaccuracies in presentation of work. A plan of work follows from the background research. The approach is systematic and includes some consideration of alternative approaches. The execution of work shows the application of knowledge gained from background research and a good effort. The project results are mostly complete, well presented and analysed.	33 30	The analysis of the work conducted shows comprehension of the work but limited insight into the significance of results. The thesis has a critical review of your recommendations for continuation of the work
<b>Satisfactory (50-64%)</b>	A satisfactory plan of work is offered. The approach is reasonably systematic. The actual execution of work shows reasonable understanding via some application of prior knowledge and some background research, it also shows satisfactory effort in the project. The project results are complete in the larger part, sufficiently presented and analysed.	29 26 23	The analysis of the work conducted demonstrates some comprehension. The thesis has a critical review of your performance. The thesis concludes with a summary of outcomes.
<b>Poor (25-49%)</b>	The plan of work offered is incomplete or unclear. The approach is not well considered, and does not logically flow from the background research presented. The actual execution of work shows flawed understanding and little application of the either background research or prior knowledge, its fails to show satisfactory effort in project. Project results poor, and/or poorly presented.	22 17 12	The analysis of the work conducted demonstrates limited comprehension. The thesis concludes with a poor summary of outcomes
<b>Very Poor (0-24%)</b>	The plan of work, if offered, is not sensible. The approach is haphazard, and has no logical basis. The actual execution of work shows very little understanding or application of the either background research or prior knowledge. Project results not on the level for undergraduate thesis work.	11 5 0	There is a very poor review of the work and no real comprehension demonstrated. The thesis concludes fails to explain what was achieved.
<b>Initial mark</b>	/100		
<b>Late penalty</b>			
<b>Final mark</b>	/100		<b>Date:</b>