

Assignment #3b: Individual Analysis Report W23

Activity: Assignment #3b: Individual Analysis Report

Course: Engineering Technical Communications (Section 4)

Name: Amey Mahendra Thakur

Criteria	Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Criterion Score
Assignment Title	0 points Assignment does not include a title.	0.5 points Assignment includes a generic title representing only the title of the assessment itself (e.g., "Individual Analysis Report" or similar).	0 points N/A	1.5 points Assignment includes an original title that informs the audience of some aspect(s) of the project, but omits information that would have been useful (e.g., "Individual Analysis Report: Improving Refrigerators"). The reader is somewhat unclear about the nature of the document after reading the title.	2 points Assignment includes a strong, original, descriptive title that successfully informs the audience of the document's focus and/or scope. ✓	2 / 2
Assignment Specifications: Length	0 points The assignment is more than 500 words (excluding visuals). Note: If your document is more than 500 words, only the first 500 words of text will be graded.	0 points N/A	0 points N/A	0 points N/A	2 points Document falls within the assignment guideline of 500 words (excluding visuals). ✓	2 / 2

Criteria	Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Criterion Score
Assignment Specifications: Visual Element	0 points No visual element included.	1 point A visual element is included but is not legible or is not relevant/appropriate.	2 points A visual element is included and is legible, but it does not contribute to clarity of the argument/document.	3 points A visual element is included and is legible. It is relevant/appropriate and contributes to the clarity of the argument/document, BUT one or all of the following is true: It is not referred to in the preceding body text; it is not captioned/titled/labelled properly; it is inadequately placed in the document (i.e., its location in the document should be more relevant/appropriate to the surrounding body text). ✓	4 points A visual element is included and is legible. It is relevant/appropriate and contributes to the clarity of the argument/document. The visual is properly titled/captioned, labelled, legible, described/referred to in the preceding body text, and appropriately placed within the document.	3 / 4

Criteria	Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Criterion Score
Assignment Specifications: Formatting	0 points Assignment is written in point form and/or fragments.	0.5 points Assignment is written in full sentences but not clearly organized into paragraphs.	1 point Assignment is written in full sentences and organized into paragraphs but is set in a typeface other than Times New Roman AND/OR or a size other than 12pt AND/OR margins are not set at 1" (2.5cm) AND/OR document does not exhibit consistency in font, colour, size, and other formatting	1.5 points Assignment is organized into proper paragraphs/sections and is primarily set in Times New Roman, 12pt font with 1" (2.5 cm) margins, but there are organizational flaws or irregularities (e.g., absence of or irregular spacing between paragraphs, irregular or incorrect indentation) that affect readability. ✓	2 points Assignment is organized into proper paragraphs/sections and is set in Times New Roman, 12pt font with 1" (2.5 cm) margins. Paragraphs begin flush with the left margin (i.e., are not indented) and are separated by consistent 12pt gaps. Document exhibits consistency in font, colour, size, and other formatting such that it is cleanly organized and attractive on the page.	1.5 / 2
Context and Audience: Stakeholders	0 points Assignment does not demonstrate awareness of audience/stakeholders within the context of the product solution and the lens chosen.	0 points N/A	3 points Some demonstrated awareness of audience/stakeholders within the context of the product solution and the lens chosen, but discussion of stakeholders could be more detailed/specific. ✓	0 points N/A	5 points Well-articulated and clear explanation of how the product solution fits into the context of the audience/stakeholders and the specific lens chosen.	3 / 5

Criteria	Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Criterion Score
Context and Audience: Geographical Scope	0 points Geographical scope is not identified or considered. ✓	1 point Geographical scope is identified but not considered within the context of the analysis.	2 points Geographical scope is identified and considered but is too broad or too narrow.	3 points Geographical scope is identified and considered. Some minor questions remain.	4 points Geographical scope is clearly identified and thoroughly and clearly considered.	0 / 4
Critical Ability/Analysis:	0 points Assignment does not engage with a single, specific smart design lens (or it is not possible to determine which lens the author has selected).	3 points The writer has clearly chosen a smart design lens and attempts critique and analysis but is unsuccessful. The author's original arguments are difficult to understand or entirely unpersuasive.	6 points The product solution is clearly described. The writer demonstrates awareness of the specific "lens" and has addressed anticipated issues related to their product solution, but not fully (or ineffectively). ✓	8 points The product solution is clearly described and critique and analysis are broadly effective, but solution may lack correlation to SDGs.	10 points Intensive critique/analysis demonstrated. The product solution is clearly described and its specific impact on two or more specific Sustainable Development Goals is thoroughly and explicitly discussed.	6 / 10

Criteria	Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Criterion Score
Organization and Coherence: Argumentative Structure	0 points Difficult to understand the document due to lack of organization and/or coherence.	1 point A principal argument is present but the document does not demonstrate unity.	3 points Principal argument is clear and arguments are unified such that the argument is effectively addressed through the body paragraphs. Some redundancy AND/OR lack of topic sentences or transitions. Headings are present but generic AND/OR some headings do not relate to the contents of accompanying paragraphs. ✓	4 points Document is well organized and the argument is clear and coherent AND paragraphs are well written. Arguments are pointed, specific, and detailed, and justified by credible evidence. Most paragraphs contain an appropriate topic sentence, discussion/exploration, and transition to the subsequent paragraph. Redundancy is limited. Headings are descriptive and appropriate.	5 points Writing is clear and effective and reveals full understanding of how to organize a document for ease of reading. All components of the document are unified. Headings are descriptive and appropriate.	3 / 5
Research	0 points Research is missing or ineffective.	1 point Research needs to be more comprehensive; sources are "popular" rather than "scholarly."	3 points Research is mostly effective and sources are appropriately used.	4 points Research is strong. Research has been conducted effectively and used appropriately to demonstrate the writer's ideas.	5 points Research is exceptional. Depth of research is appropriate for graduate-level work and reveals strong ability to select relevant, scholarly, and credible sources that clearly and effectively support the writer's claims. ✓	5 / 5

Criteria	Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Criterion Score
IEEE Citing and Referencing	0 points Missing one or more citations and/or references.	1 point Many errors are made in IEEE citing and referencing style.	3 points Some errors are made in IEEE citing and referencing style.	4 points IEEE citing and referencing is well done. Assignment contains few or minor errors. In-text citations and references adhere to IEEE Style guidelines and material is cited as appropriate. ✓	5 points IEEE is excellent. There are no errors in IEEE style in the document.	4 / 5
Grammar and Style/"Professionalism"	0 points Assignment is very poorly written. The reader is unable to discern the author's meaning on multiple occasions.	1 point Assignment is not well written. Some errors in the grammar/style impede audience understanding/confuse the writer's argument.	2 points Assignment is fairly well written. Some grammatical errors, but they do not impede audience understanding. Document is mostly persuasive.	3 points Assignment is mostly well written. Few grammatical errors, and they do not impede audience understanding. Document is mostly persuasive. Writing is clear and concise at the sentence level. ✓	4 points Assignment is well written and easy to read and understand. The writing is indicative of a solid understanding of how to write professional documents. Writing is persuasive and there are few to no grammatical or spelling errors.	3 / 4

Criteria	Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Criterion Score
Pronouns, Inclusivity, and Regional Appropriateness	0 points Document contains many instances of first- or second-person pronoun use, instances of non-gender-neutral or otherwise non-inclusive language, and/or American/foreign spellings and/or units of measurement.	0 points N/A	1 point Document contains some instances of first- or second-person pronoun use, inappropriate language, and/or American/foreign spellings and/or units of measurement.	0 points N/A	2 points Neither first- nor second-person pronouns are used and language is consistently appropriate. Conventional Canadian spelling and units are used throughout. ✓	2 / 2
Originality and Paraphrase: "A" level descriptions present original content, and the synthesis of existing literature is well executed, and proper paraphrasing techniques are used throughout.	0 points Sources are improperly quoted or paraphrased.	2.5 points Paraphrasing is poor. Document relies primarily on poorly integrated direct quotations instead of paraphrase.	5 points Paraphrasing is acceptable. Claims are generally supported by properly paraphrased secondary sources, but integration of outside texts is often cumbersome.	7.5 points Paraphrasing is good. Claims are generally supported by properly paraphrased secondary sources, but integration of outside texts is occasionally cumbersome. ✓	10 points Paraphrasing is excellent. Report appropriately integrates outside texts throughout. Claims are consistently supported by properly paraphrased secondary sources.	7.5 / 10

Total

42 / 60

Overall Score

Insufficient

Needs Improvement

Satisfactory

Good

Excellent

