

Assessment Item	FAIL / insufficient	PASS/fair	PASS/good	PASS/excellent
<b>Motivation</b>	No attempt is made at writing a motivation, or a cursory attempt is made that fails to convey why the project is important or relevant.	A brief relevant motivation statement is provided. It is technically correct but may be vague or lack depth. Shows minimal understanding of why the project matters.	As Fair, but the motivation is more detailed, clearly stated, and shows a stronger understanding of the project's relevance.	The motivation is thorough, compelling, and clearly demonstrates both the importance and relevance of the project.
<b>State-of-the-art</b>	No attempt is made at reviewing the literature, or a cursory attempt is made that fails to cover relevant sources. Does not demonstrate understanding of the field or link literature to the project. Strengths, weaknesses, or gaps in the literature are not identified.	A technically correct summary of essential literature is provided. Some aspects may be vague, incorrect, or limited in depth. There is some identification of strengths, weaknesses, or gaps, but links back to the project are weak or unclear. Sufficient understanding to start the project is demonstrated.	Literature review is more extensive and correct in detail. Strengths, weaknesses, and gaps are clearly identified and mostly linked to the project, showing critical engagement. There may be minor omissions, but overall demonstrates solid understanding and relevance.	Literature review is comprehensive and accurate. Strengths, weaknesses, and gaps are thoroughly identified and explicitly linked to the project, demonstrating critical analysis and deep understanding. Shows evidence of independent thought and synthesis beyond the initially provided sources.
<b>Method / Approach</b>	It is not clear to the reader what the research methodology to be used will be.	The methodology is described in sufficient detail to understand what the research approach will be and why it is relevant to the topic. It may be fairly high level and lack a wider appreciation of alternative methods. A basic evaluation plan is in place.	As fair but the evaluation criteria will be more convincing and the expected outcomes clearly defined.	As good but the methodology will be more robustly described with consideration of alternative approaches and a convincing argument provided for the best methods for the research.
<b>Research Plan</b>	The research plan does not contain the minimum pass/fair criteria.	The workplan contains a breakdown of the project into three or more tasks with an approximate timeline, at least one milestone and a Gantt chart. The plan will be broadly sound but may contain minor inconsistencies. The risk analysis is present but might not be fully developed.	As fair but the workplan is more fully developed with no significant inconsistencies and the risk/mitigation plan, dependencies and needed resources are more mature	The implementation plan is comprehensive in every respect and is very convincing.
<b>Responsible Research</b>	The assessment of the ethical implications of the research is missing or is not sufficient.	Ethics at a minimum have been considered appropriately for the project. There may be a wider consideration of some other aspects of responsible research such as a data management plan or software license plan.	As fair but the wider aspects of responsible research have been comprehensively addressed with all relevant aspects described competently.	As good but the analysis of responsible research shows a more impressive depth of understanding with potentially new areas identified by the student.
<b>References</b>	Citations and/or references are incorrect or missing	Citations and literature are mostly cited correctly	Literature and citations are correct	n/a

To pass, all 6 aspects should achieve a PASS/fair mark.

A good or excellent in any section can compensate for a single fail/insufficient