

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