

## Assessment Matrix

**Report** (To be completed by School of Engineering staff only.)

Grade Range (Highest to Lowest)	A1, A2, A3, A4, A5	B1, B2, B3	C1, C2, C3	D1, D2, D3	E1, E2, E3	F1, F2, F3	G1, G2, H
Descriptor	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Weak	Poor	G: Very Poor H: No Attainment
<b>Writing</b> (Weighting = 1)	Exceptionally clear, precise and concise English. Excellent spelling & grammar, few typos.	Clear and well written, easy to understand, and mostly free of errors.	Most of the text is clear and easily understood. There are some issues with grammar and spelling.	The text can be understood, but some elements are not entirely clear. A sizeable volume of errors is noticeable.	Hard to understand much of the text. Significant spelling errors and grammatical flaws.	The volume and nature of the grammatical errors, combined with poor writing makes this report difficult to read.	Unintelligible. Impossible to read due to exceptionally poor use of English.
<b>Presentation &amp; Figures</b> (Weighting = 1)	Professional standard of presentation. All illustrations are well formatted and presented.	A clear and consistent presentation style making it easy to read. Most of the figures are clear and well presented.	There are some minor flaws in the presentation and the clarity of the figures, but overall a well presented report.	A number of basic errors present – inconsistent use of styles, margins etc. Figures are satisfactory.	Significant flaws in the presentation detracting from the overall impression of the report. Flawed figures – badly drawn and untidy,	Unacceptable presentation: untidy and inconsistent use of styles. Figures are messy and unclear.	A messy report – no evidence of any effective effort on the quality of the presentation. Report is hard to follow due to unclear figures.
<b>Organisation &amp; Structure</b> (Weighting = 1)	Structure is entirely correct with all sections correctly placed. Reading contents gives clear overview.	A well organised report with all sections logically placed enhancing understanding of work.	A report which is sufficiently well organised to make reading the report easy.	There may be some issues with the structure, but these do not detract from overall quality.	There are flaws in the way the report is structured which damages the overall quality of the report.	Serious flaws in structure which makes it difficult to read and understand the report.	No discernable structure. Illogical placement of sections. Impossible to follow argument.
<b>Literature Survey</b> (Weighting = 1)	Exemplary range of references used and discussed in great depth, indicating comprehensive background reading.	An appropriate range of relevant references used and discussed suggesting substantial background reading.	Sufficient references used and discussed to indicate a good level of background reading.	Perhaps just enough references used and discussed to suggest some background reading was undertaken. Too many "www" references.	Too few relevant references used and discussed and possibly an over reliance on www sources indicating insufficient background work.	Only a few references used and discussed and majority are irrelevant. Little evidence of background reading.	Very few (or no) references used or discussed. No evidence of any background reading.
<b>Technical Content &amp; Quality of Analysis</b> (Weighting = 3)	Well informed and authoritative discussion and a comprehensive analysis of a significantly complex technical problem.	Clear and reasoned arguments backed up with a significant analysis indicating a very good grasp of a difficult technical problem.	Arguments presented are of a reasonable technical level, supported by a good quality analysis, and have been well considered and clearly stated.	The arguments presented are of reasonable technical depth, supported by some analysis and show a satisfactory understanding.	Only limited critical discussion of the technical problem studied. Little analysis or a low level of analysis. Suggests limited understanding of problem.	Very little evidence of critical discussion of technical work or results. Superficial understanding of problem. Minimal analysis included.	The lack of quality of the technical argument suggests that the student has very little understanding of the problem. No analysis.