# EEE6480 Interim report assessment – marking criteria

| Criterion | Mark range | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 - 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 - 10 |
| **A1) Literature review** | Little or irrelevant literature review. Inappropriate referencing, poor sources | Insufficiently thorough or relevant literature review. Refs not referred to or formatted appropriately | Reasonably thorough review of relevant literature. Inconsistent Referencing | Sufficient review of relevant literature, but could be better. Correct referencing. | Comprehensive well written review of relevant literature. Well referenced. | A concise and informative critical review of the state of the art. Many references well used. |
| **A2) Project plan** | Poor or absent project plan, no risk assessments. No milestones | Very basic project plan, poorly composed, unfeasible, or poorly described. Incomplete risk assessments. No milestones | Adequate project plan. May be too brief or unrealistic. Overly brief risk assessments. Some milestones identified | Sufficient and realistic project plan, meeting project objectives. Good risk assessments and milestone identification | Very good, well considered project plan and intelligent risk assessments and mitigation strategies. Sensible milestones. | An excellent project plan with measurable milestones and perceptive risk assessment and management strategies |
| **A3) Overall presentation** | Hard to read, no structure, poor quality, Difficult to follow aims/objectives | Just adequate. Careless formatting. Flawed structure | Reasonable presentation. Some deficiencies (poor diagrams, formatting) | Good and effective presentation, but could be more incisive. Easy to follow aims and objectives | Very good presentation. Correctly formatted. Concise & informative aims and objectives | Excellent. Sensible structure and format. Easy and informative to read. Model statement of aims and objectives |
| **C1) Grasp of the project material** | Little or no grasp of the project objectives, context or theory. Many technical errors. Unable to answer questions. | Inadequate or very basic grasp of project objectives, theory and context. Technically weak. Able to answer simple questions only. | Reasonable account of project objectives & background. Some technical deficiencies. Willing to have a go at answering questions. | Good grasp of project objectives and theory. Technical arguments mostly good. Confident and mostly competent answers to questions. | Comprehensive grasp of project objectives, theory & context. Technical arguments sound. Confident and competent answers to questions. | Excellent grasp of project objectives. Lucid technical arguments. Able to discuss any aspect of the project expertly. |
| **C2) Presentation of their project summary** | Slides confusing, virtually empty or wrong. No introduction and conclusions. Poor quality slides, disorganised and incoherent delivery. | Adequate material but carelessly formatted. Slides hard to interpret. Mumbling and disorganised delivery. Was often lost. | Reasonable presentation. Slides OK but some format issues - graph axes, font size, colour scheme. May have depended heavily on notes | Good and effective presentation, but could be more incisive. Easy to understand what is being done. | Very good presentation. Concise & informative explanation, good use of visual aids. Enjoyable. | Excellent structure and format. Expertly delivered presentation of all required aspects. |