

TABLE 1. Set of minimum criteria per mark band for **Applied Mathematics & Statistics** projects.

Mark range	Third Year	MSci
<40	Failed	Failed
40-50	Bare pass. The student shows very weak understanding of the project. Bad exposition. Some work has been done nonetheless.	Failed
50-60	Decent exposition. Some work, typically computational. Still weak understanding of the problem.	Decent exposition. Some numerics/data analysis performed, but naive interpretation overall and weak understanding of the problem addressed. Still the student manages to produce something reasonable.
60-70	Shows signs of a decent understanding of the problem. Some background theory, some numerical analysis. Decent exposition	Good exposition. Some background theory reported correctly. The student shows a decent understanding of the problem he's addressing. Decent computational results (numerical simulations, data analysis).
70-80	Good exposition and good mix of background theory with numerical analysis.	Good exposition, good background theory. The student shows clear signs of fully understanding the problem he's addressing, including the bigger picture. There is good computational work (numerical simulations, data analysis) which also includes new analysis (not necessarily replications of previous, published work).
80-90	Like 70-80 but now in addition the student has produced new results (typically computational).	Fulfills criteria for 70-80 but on top of that, the main focus of the project is on novel material (typically computational work) which is non-trivial, might be publishable after some additional work. Very good exposition and good background theory. The student fully understands the problem and the bigger picture. New results might be not publishable, but in that case the computational work is thorough and the topic is hard (i.e. requires a good deal of work).
>90	Very good exposition, an excellent balance of background theory and computational results. This work would be publishable if extended appropriately.	Excellent exposition, excellent background theory, new results that constitute publishable material after few, minor corrections.

TABLE 2. Set of minimum criteria per mark band for **Pure** projects.

Mark range	Third Year	MSci
<40	Failed	Failed
40-50	Bare pass. The student shows very weak understanding of the project. Bad exposition. Some work has been done nonetheless.	Failed
50-60	Decent exposition. Some work, typically regurgitating results. Still weak understanding of the problem.	Decent exposition. Some proofs/technical definitions given, but in a way which suggests they have not been understood. Weak understanding of the problem addressed. Still the student manages to produce something reasonable.
60-70	Shows signs of a decent understanding of the problem. Some background theory, some coherent definitions and proofs and evidence that student appreciates the overall objectives. Decent exposition	Good exposition. Some background theory correctly used to motivate the work. The student shows a decent understanding of the problem he's addressing. Decent logical progression from definitions through proofs and corollaries to desired results (making it explicit where omissions/assumptions have been made as material falls outside scope of work).
70-80	Good exposition - proofs and definitions not only coherent but demonstrating insight and intuition. Significance of work explained and related to other progress in the field.	Good exposition, good knowledge of field. The student shows clear signs of fully understanding the problem he's addressing, including the bigger picture. This is demonstrated by analogies, intuitions and opinions that have come from the student. There is a clear logical progression through the report, and the proofs are not only coherent, but it is clear that the student has taken ownership of them and explained them in their own terms.
80-90	Like 70-80 but now in addition the student has produced new results (typically worked examples illustrating results, or alternatively corollaries which the student has identified as of interest).	Fulfils criteria for 70-80 but on top of that, the main focus of the project is on novel material which is non-trivial, and might be publishable after some additional work. Very good exposition and good background theory. The student fully understands the problem and the bigger picture. Student's new results need not be publishable, but the proofs are thorough, the implications (and unresolved issues) are thought through and the topic is hard (i.e. requires a good deal of work).
>90	Very good exposition, non-trivial new results proved. This work would be publishable if extended appropriately.	Excellent exposition, excellent background theory, new results that constitute publishable material after few, minor corrections.