

	Mark scale					
Criterion	0 - 7	8 - 9	10 - 11	12 - 13	14 - 15	16 - 20
D1) Products	Minimal or no achievement - all or most objectives missed without reason	Work was done but it failed to meet aims. Experiments compromised by failure to plan. Many excuses offered.	Reasonable progress - will have met some objectives but parts incomplete	Good progress at meeting objectives - most difficulties overcome - some creativity	Very good progress - objectives met or exceeded - any difficulties overcome	Excellent progress - problems overcome - extra objectives created and met.
D2) Processes	Has failed to grasp major aspects of the work - limited ability even with guidance	Very superficial understanding of the project aims and substance. Needed guidance on virtually all issues but did not develop .	Reasonable analysis and understanding of most parts - competent design and testing but limited justification of design choices or explanation of experimental processes.	Good analysis and understanding of most aspects - some originality - appreciates consequences of decisions.	Very good analysis and interpretation with original parts and full awareness of the effects of decisions. All design decisions and experimental methods fully justified.	Expert analysis and understanding - can educate supervisor - highly original and publishable work.
D3) Evaluation	No attempt at interpretation of the few (if any) results - discussion absent, naive or irrelevant.	Superficial attempt to explain results, measurements and theory probably for different conditions - nothing quite properly tied up.	Reasonable interpretation but some flaws - reasonable further work suggested. Perhaps experimental results not compared with theory or design performance not compared with spec.	Interpretation makes full use of results - good further work suggested - critical evaluation compared to initial objectives.	Evidence based arguments and imaginative further work suggestions presented. Achievements evaluated critically against objectives or specs.	Excellent critical evaluation of project. Suggestions for further work imaginative and perceptive. Work of publishable standard.
D4) Use of sources and resources	Poor use of relevant literature, available computing and/or experimental tools.	No evidence of understanding of literature. Weak in application of computational and experimental tools	Adequate methodology - available tools have generally been used properly.	Competent use of available tools and sound methodology	Very good and creative use of tools and resources. Sound and well justified methodologies	Excellent and probably innovative use of tools and, perhaps, creation of new tools.
D5) Presentation	Report hard to read - no structure - poor use of language - poor referencing - very poor quality diagrams.	Report readable but no sensible formatting or structure, poor diagrams that missed the point	Readable and coherent report - reasonable diagrams, structure and referencing.	Readable and interesting - good diagrams, structure and referencing.	Well written and structured, easy to read and informative. Diagrams relevant and of good quality.	Excellent presentation - concise and informative. Structure, diagrams, referencing, use of English all outstanding
	1 - 3	4	5	6	7	8 - 10
Poster	Non - attendance or minimal effort. Disorganised layout; cannot explain poster contents	Poor poster layout, font too small, diagrams illegible, answers attempted but difficult to understand	Reasonable poster layout - able to answer some questions	Some good features in poster layout. Questions mostly answered in a comprehensible way.	Very good poster layout. Questions answered at an appropriate level in a clear and concise way.	Excellent poster layout. Masterful performance in answering questions and talking around the subject.