

Criteria	Unacceptable [0]	Poor [1]	Fair [2]	Good [3]	Very Good [4]	Excellent [5]	Weighting [60]
Overall and individual Introduction, problem Statement and requirements analysis Was the engineering problem clearly formulated and achievable? Did the student understand the nature of the investigation?	Poor or no attempt at an introduction and poorly formulated problem statement or engineering problem.	Both the report and section introduction are poor, not completely clear what the problem is. Poor requirements analysis section	Poor report or section introduction but fair attempt at one of them. Problem formulation too verbose or barely there. Fair attempt at requirements analysis	Good, clear introduction for report or individual section but not both with a clear problem formulation but perhaps not achievable within the report scope. Good requirements analysis	Well written introduction for both the report and individual sections with clear and achievable problem but somewhat verbose. Goal of project is clear and requirements analysis is well done	Excellent introduction for both report and individual section and well thought out problem formulation concisely stated. Goal of project is clear and excellent requirements analysis	5
Design and Theory Is there clear development of theory? Is the design well described? Is the description clear enough to allow another student to duplicate it? Does the understanding of the theory inform the design of the project.	Very little understanding, poor application of theory.	Some discussion of method and limitations. Incomplete theory development and design description.	Partial discussion of method and limitations, some theory development. Weak design description.	Satisfactory discussion of method, some limitations, and justification for using method in terms of question/problem. Solid design description	Thorough discussion of method and limitations. Good theory development and complete design description for replication.	Creative development of methodology/theory which progresses method in the field. Meticulous care in design description.	20
Practical work, simulation and software How much practical work has been done? Were the procedures verified using ATPs, either by experiments or clear reasoning?	Inadequate practical work done with respect to quantity and quality.	Barely adequate in terms of either quantity or quality, some useful content.	Adequate in terms of quantity and/or quality but fails to address problem fully.	Suitable practical work done which addresses problem statement and system requirements.	Thorough practical work done which fully covers the problem statement and system requirements.	Exceptional rigour demonstrated in practical work.	20
Results: Interpretation and conclusions Are the results interpreted clearly? Are the conclusions reached clearly supported in the results and linked to the research question/engineering problem? Are suggestions made for further research?	Superficial and/or Irrelevant analysis. Little or no synthesis of information, no link to research questions / problem, no suggestions for future research.	Testing was performed, but little discussion provided. Little synthesis of information, some interpretation, but poor link to problems.	Testing was performed, and some results discussed. Partially answers research problem. Some weakness in summary of results and suggestions for future work.	Thorough testing was performed, and results were discussed. Some conclusions absent or not fully supported. Adequate analysis which covers basics of problem. Some suggestions for further work.	Accurate analysis, drawing out features of the data and speaking to research questions/engineering problem. Good suggestions for further research. Thorough testing was performed to verify the design.	Thorough testing was performed, and the results discussed in detail and significant insight provided. Creative analysis which draws out pertinent solutions to problem & highlights additional features.	10
Presentation, layout, referencing Is the report done in a professional way? Is the use of grammar acceptable? Is the material properly referenced?	Unprofessional work. Poor grammar. Refs missing, poor understanding of citation conventions.	Problems with layout, careless grammar errors. Presentation unsatisfactory. Some facts not referenced.	Layout and presentation could be improved. Referencing sometimes patchy, mistakes made with grammar.	Layout and presentation acceptable. A few minor errors in grammar and referencing.	Very few, if any, errors in citations. Care demonstrated with grammar, layout and presentation.	Only one or two minor errors in grammar, No errors in referencing. Presentation and layout thoughtful and professional.	5