

BOARD OF STUDIES IN COMPUTER SCIENCE

GENERIC MARKING DESCRIPTORS FOR UNDERGRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMMES (SINCE 2004)

		Qualitative description				
Grade Percentage		for practical exercises and projects		for exercises, presentations, projects, and written examinations		
A++	90%–100%	Exceptional work of publishable or professional quality.	Displays an <i>exceptional</i> degree of originality and creativity and / or <i>exceptional</i> analytical and problem-solving skills. Solution must have novel aspects.	The methodology employed is well-developed and correct.	Shows <i>critical</i> understanding of current knowledge. For level 3 this should including relevant recent research papers.	Perceptive, focused treatment of all issues/questions presented in a critical and scholarly way.
A+	80%–89%	Outstanding work.	Displays a level of originality and creativity and / or the ability to suggest realistic solutions to novel problems.	The methodology employed is well-developed and correct.	Evidence of wide reading. For level 3 this should include relevant research papers and books.	Perceptive, focused treatment of all issues/questions presented in a critical and scholarly way.
A	70%–79%	Excellent work.	Demonstrates ability to analyse, interpret and organise information to produce coherent accounts or solve complex problems.	All aspect of a suitable methodology evident and used correctly.	Comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the subject together with the ability to put the work into context and to critically evaluate selected aspects of the work.	Arguments/answers will be clear, competently structured, and accurate.
B	60%–69%	Competent work.	Demonstrates ability to analyse, interpret and organise information to produce coherent accounts or solve relatively complex problems.	Use of a suitable methodology evident and used correctly, with minor omissions.	Good knowledge and understanding of the subject, with no major gaps or omissions, but minor gaps or omissions may occur.	Arguments/answers will be clear, competently structured, and largely accurate.
C	50%–59%	Satisfactory work.	Displays ability to analyse, interpret and organise information to produce coherent accounts or solve well-defined problems of some scope.	Most aspects of a suitable methodology evident and used correctly, some omissions occur but without negative impact on the result of the work.	Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the essentials of the subject, with an ability to integrate information into a clear, well-structured account, but lacking in breadth or depth, or with some significant aspects omitted.	Arguments/answers must be clear, although they may not be well-developed or reflect a wider appreciation of the subject. Some errors and omissions are likely to be present.
D	40%–49%	Adequate work displaying some deficiencies and omissions but not serious enough to warrant a failure.	Demonstrates an ability to solve limited, well-defined, problems of a familiar type.	Most aspects of a suitable methodology evident, but minor flaws in its use or omissions with some negative impact on the result of the work.	General knowledge and understanding of the subject but very limited in depth or breadth.	Arguments/answers are likely to be somewhat lacking in structure. There are likely to be errors and omissions and the evidence provided to support arguments will be very limited.
E+	35%–39%	Marginal failure; work displays deficiencies and omissions too serious to warrant a pass.	Fails to demonstrate an ability to solve limited, well-defined, problems of a familiar type.	Aspects of a suitable methodology evident, but flaws in its use or omissions which negatively impact on the result of the work.	Knowledge and understanding of the subject are fragmentary, some aspects showing a very basic level of understanding but other aspects displaying fundamental errors and omissions.	Arguments/answers are lacking in structure. There are errors and omissions and the evidence provided to support arguments is very limited.

		Qualitative description				
Grade Percentage		for practical exercises and projects		for exercises, presentations, projects, and written examinations		
E-	30%–34%	Non-marginal failure; work displays serious deficiencies and omissions.	Fails to demonstrate an ability to solve simple, well-defined, problems of a familiar type.	Lack of the use of a suitable methodology or flaws in its use which negatively impact on the result of the work.	Knowledge and understanding of the subject are fragmentary, with an insufficient number of aspects showing a very basic level of understanding and too many aspects displaying fundamental errors and omissions.	Arguments/answers are lacking in structure. There are errors and omissions and the evidence provided to support arguments is very limited.
F	20%–29%	Work shows little effort and contains serious deficiencies and omissions.	Fails to demonstrate an ability to solve simple, well-defined, problems of a familiar type under guidance.	Serious lack of the use of a suitable methodology or flaws in its use which negatively impact on the result of the work.	Very limited range of knowledge with many important gaps and omissions. Shows incomplete understanding with numerous errors of interpretation.	Arguments/answers have little structure, contain serious errors, and there is no support for arguments.
F-	10%–19%	Work shows little adherence to the tasks.		Little evidence of the use of a suitable methodology.	Shows only the most limited and fragmentary knowledge of the subject with little or no understanding of essential principles and concepts. Work is likely to be unstructured and ill-presented.	Arguments/answers are only loosely related to issues/questions or only cover a seriously inadequate part of the issues/questions.
G	0%–10%	Nominal or complete lack of work.		No evidence of the use of a suitable methodology.	Virtually devoid of any evidence of knowledge or understanding of the subject.	No or almost no arguments/answers.