

MIND6004 Feasibility Study Marking Scheme

iPhD	Range	Category	Typical Attributes
Progress to research phase	90%+	A*	<i>Exceptional across the board</i>
			<i>I</i> Outstanding discussion of benefits and potential negative impacts on a range of stakeholders; Exceptional discussion of mitigation strategies
			<i>T</i> Outstanding analysis, design and implementation; use of an extensive range, or thorough exploration of techniques
			<i>E</i> Outstanding testing, critical and comparative evaluation and reflection
			<i>A</i> Outstanding achievement, new and publishable results
			<i>W</i> Extremely well written, structured and formatted, no spelling or grammatical errors; Extensive review of related work and references as in a typical research paper; Abstract can be read independently
			<i>D</i> Demonstration of extensive knowledge; Excellent answers to questions; Outstanding presentation of the problem; Exceptional justifications
	80%–89%	A+	<i>Exceptional in many elements</i>
			<i>I</i> Excellent discussion of benefits and potential negative impacts on a range of stakeholders; Excellent discussion of mitigation strategies
			<i>T</i> Excellent analysis, design and implementation; use of a wide range, or significant exploration of techniques
			<i>E</i> Excellent testing, critical and comparative evaluation and reflection
			<i>A</i> Excellent achievement; innovation and creativity; worthy of publication
			<i>W</i> Very well written, structured and formatted, few spelling or grammatical errors; Strong review of related work; Abstract can be read independently
			<i>D</i> Demonstration of excellent knowledge; Excellent answers to questions; Excellent presentation of the problem; Strong justifications
	70%–79%	A	<i>Exceptional elements</i>
			<i>I</i> Excellent discussion of benefits and potential negative impacts on a range of stakeholders; Good and clear discussion of mitigation strategies
			<i>T</i> Detailed analysis; Very well designed and implemented; Use of a range, or very good exploration of techniques
			<i>E</i> Very good testing, critical and comparative evaluation and reflection
			<i>A</i> Significant achievement; innovation and creativity; worthy of utilisation
			<i>W</i> Very well written, structured and formatted, review of related work including research papers
			<i>D</i> Demonstration of very good knowledge; Excellent answers to questions; Informed presentation of the problem; Very good justifications
	60%–69%	B	<i>A very good feasibility study</i>
			<i>I</i> Very good discussion of benefits and potential negative impacts on a range of stakeholders; Some discussion of mitigation strategies
			<i>T</i> Good technical skills, well designed and implemented, with adequate analysis; Good exploration of techniques
			<i>E</i> Well tested, good evaluation and reflection
			<i>A</i> All major goals achieved, possibly worth of utilisation, a challenging project
			<i>W</i> Well written, structured and formatted, review of related work, references to material used
			<i>D</i> Demonstration of very good knowledge; Clear answers to questions; Very good presentation of the problem; Well argued justifications

iPhD	Range	Category	Typical Attributes
MSc	50%–59% C		<i>Close to the aims of the feasibility study</i>
		<i>I</i>	Discussion of benefits and potential negative impacts; Indication of at least one mitigation strategy
		<i>T</i>	Adequate technical skills, adequately designed and implemented, some analysis and modelling; Use of suitable techniques
		<i>E</i>	Adequate testing and evaluation
		<i>A</i>	Most major goals have been achieved, less significant challenge
		<i>W</i>	Adequately written, structured and formatted, some background reading and references
Fail	40%–49% D		<i>Some evidence of progress</i>
		<i>I</i>	Discussion of benefits and potential negative impacts; Mitigation discussed
		<i>T</i>	Adequate technical skills, but with some weaknesses in analysis, design, and implementation
		<i>E</i>	Partial testing and evaluation
		<i>A</i>	Some major goals have been achieved, project not very challenging
		<i>W</i>	Adequately written, some background reading; Some errors in structure, format or contents
	30%–39% E		<i>Little evidence of progress</i>
		<i>I</i>	Discussion of benefits or potential negative impacts; No mitigation strategies
		<i>T</i>	Poor technical skills, weak analysis, design and implementation
		<i>E</i>	Little testing or evaluation
		<i>A</i>	Little achievement or challenge
		<i>W</i>	Poorly written and structured report, little evidence of background reading, poor referencing
	0%–29% F		<i>Very little evidence of progress</i>
		<i>I</i>	Poor or no discussion of benefits and potential negative impacts
		<i>T</i>	No, or very poor, technical skills, analysis, design, and implementation
		<i>E</i>	No, or very poor, testing and evaluation
		<i>A</i>	No, or very low, achievement and challenge
		<i>W</i>	No, or badly written report; no or hardly any, references
		<i>D</i>	Lack of demonstration of knowledge; No justifications

Legend

Category	Description
<i>I</i>	Impact assessment
<i>T</i>	Technical approach, engineering, analysis, modelling, design, use of tools
<i>E</i>	Testing, critical and comparative evaluation and reflection
<i>A</i>	Achievement, innovation, creativity, challenge, research contribution
<i>W</i>	Report writing, structure, format, literature, references
<i>D</i>	Technical/scientific demonstration and viva voce (note this element is 30% of the total mark)