

Marking Rubric – Technical Report

Criteria	80+	70-79	60-69	50-59	40-49	30-39	0-29
Structure	The topic is outstandingly clear, concise, and exceptionally presented. The report is well-structured, information is logically presented.	The topic is presented clearly. Information is logically organised with a cohesive flow making the report easy to follow.	The topic is presented clearly. The aims and objectives of the report are addressed. The discussion is organised well, making the report easy to follow.	The work is presented well and attempts to address the subject but lacks focus. The information presented sometimes lacks coherence, which makes it challenging to follow.	The report is poorly organised and lacks focus which makes it difficult to follow.	The report has no argument or focus and does not present new information.	The report is unstructured and not related to the topic.
Knowledge and Understanding	The report demonstrates an extensive level of knowledge that informs and can be understood by all the members of the audience. Facts are almost faultless, there is comprehensive coverage of the topic with evidence of original thinking. Excellent evidence of extensive reading and research.	The report demonstrates a very good level of knowledge that informs and can be understood by all the members of the audience. Facts are correct, there is very good coverage of the topic with evidence of original thinking. Good evidence of extensive reading and research.	The report demonstrates a good level of knowledge that informs and can be understood by all the members of the audience. Facts are correct, there is good coverage of the topic with evidence of original thinking. Good evidence of extensive reading and research.	The report demonstrates an acceptable level of knowledge that is accessible to most of the audience. Facts are correct, but only basic aspects are presented, and some critical elements are missing. Some evidence of extended further reading or research.	The report demonstrates some level of knowledge but is not accessible to all members of the audience. Some errors or misconceptions are present. No evidence of extended further reading or research.	The report demonstrates very limited knowledge and understanding. Serious omissions, errors or misconceptions.	The report demonstrates very little knowledge or understanding and not relevant to the discussion.
Technical Content	The report presents technical content with an exceptional level of detail and thoroughness of documentation. An appropriate technical language is used, and processes are discussed clearly, including all the techniques used and results achieved. The report provides excellent independent analytical and critical treatment when discussing the methods, results, implications, limitations.	The report presents technical content with a very good level of detail and thoroughness of documentation. An appropriate technical language is used, and processes are discussed clearly, including all the techniques used and results achieved. The report provides good independent analytical and critical treatment when discussing the methods, results, implications, limitations.	The report presents technical content with a good level of detail and thoroughness of documentation. An appropriate technical language is used, and processes are discussed clearly, including all the techniques used and results achieved. The report provides good independent analytical and critical treatment when discussing the methods, results, implications, limitations.	The report presents technical content with an acceptable level of detail and thoroughness of documentation. An appropriate technical language is used, and processes, techniques and results are discussed. The report presents a basic critical analysis, lacking details and personal critique over methods, results, implications, limitations.	The report presents some technical content with a poor level of detail. An appropriate technical language is somehow used, and processes, techniques and results are poorly discussed. No critical analysis is presented.	The report presents very limited technical content and in an unstructured form.	No technical content is presented.

Analysis and evaluation	The report employs an outstanding critical analysis and interpretation of the results as they relate to the technical project. The submission interweaves theory in a strong and highly convincing manner in support of the interpretation.	The report employs an excellent and thorough critical analysis and interpretation of the results as they relate to the technical project. The submission offers original interpretations of the results and evaluation.	The submission clearly demonstrates an understanding of the subject through critical analysis and interpretation of the results as they relate to the technical project. Strong evidence of evaluation.	The report demonstrates a clear understanding of some elements of the subject matter, through some analysis and interpretation of the results as they relate to the technical project. There is some evidence of evaluation.	The report demonstrates a poor understanding of the subject matter with little to no analysis and interpretation of the results. Includes weak evidence of evaluation.	The report demonstrates a very poor understanding of the subject matter with little to no analysis and interpretation of the results. No evidence of evaluation.	The report does not demonstrate any understanding of the subject and no analysis and interpretation of the results. No evidence of evaluation.
Academic Rigour and Referencing (Harvard Style)	The report includes appropriate evidential support, which demonstrates substantial wider reading which is cited and referenced appropriately.	The report provides wide-ranging and appropriate evidential support for claims that are made, which are referenced appropriately throughout.	Arguments made are supported with reference to relevant literature. All or most of the references are referenced appropriately.	Draws on relevant material but does not use it to explicitly address some key issues in the question. There is a tendency to make claims without supporting evidence. References missing or incomplete.	Evidence is not appropriately used to support claims that are made. No attempt is made to reference correctly, or there are substantial errors in referencing.	The report demonstrates that reading has taken place, but there are no citations or references.	The report does not demonstrate that reading has taken place, and there are no citations or references.
Format, Style and Language	Report displays an excellent use of standard written English. Writing is smooth, coherent and consistent with central idea.	Report displays an excellent use of standard written English. Writing is smooth, coherent and consistent with central idea.	Report displays a very good standard written English with all statements clearly expressed. Writing is coherent and consistent with central idea.	Report displays a very standard written English with few, if any, grammatical or spelling errors. Written in an appropriately academic style. Writing is coherent and consistent with central idea.	The work is written to an acceptable standard of English. There may be some grammatical errors and the work may need more careful editing. Writing is incoherent and/or inconsistent with central idea.	More care needs to be taken with elements of grammar, spelling and sentence construction. Writing is confusing and hard to follow.	Poor standard of written English. Inappropriate register or tenses. Writing is confusing and hard to follow.

Programming (if present)	The work is exceptionally organised with no errors. It follows coding standards, with the correct use of the programming language syntax, and appropriate documentation is presented. In runtime, no errors or warnings are presented. The solution is efficient, easy to understand and maintain.	The work is very well organised with no errors. It follows coding standards, with the correct use of the programming language syntax, and appropriate documentation is presented. In runtime, a few cosmetic errors or warnings are presented. The solution is efficient, easy to understand and maintain.	The work is well organised with a few superficial errors. It follows coding standards, with the correct use of the programming language syntax, and appropriate documentation is presented. In runtime, some cosmetic errors or warnings are presented. The solution is appropriate, easy to understand and maintain.	The work presents some superficial errors, and it overall follows coding standards. Basic appropriate documentation is presented. In runtime, some errors or warnings are shown. The solution is appropriate, but it might not be easy to understand and maintain.	The work presented is not well organised, and it has some errors. Coding standards are used occasionally.	The work presented has multiple errors, does not follow coding standards, and does not run.	No code presented.
Engagement and Contribution to the Group (if applicable)	The submission clearly demonstrates a thorough engagement in all parts of the project and throughout its entire development. The group member participated fully in the project and shared the workload fairly, attending all meetings and responding to the other members in a timely manner. The student demonstrated a clear commitment to work towards achieving the project goals and meeting the deadline.	The submission demonstrates an excellent engagement in all parts of the project and throughout its entire development. The group member participated fully in the project and shared the workload fairly, attending meetings and responding to the other members in a timely manner. The student demonstrated a clear commitment to work towards achieving the project goals and meeting the deadline.	The submission demonstrates a good engagement in all parts of the project and throughout its entire development. The group member participated fully in the project and shared the workload fairly, attending meetings and responding to the other members in a timely manner. The student demonstrated a good commitment to work towards achieving the project goals and meeting the deadline.	The submission demonstrates an acceptable engagement in all parts of the project and throughout its entire development. The group member participated in the project and shared the workload fairly, attending meetings and responding to the other members in a timely manner. The student demonstrated an acceptable commitment to work towards achieving the project goals and meeting the deadline.	The submission demonstrates poor engagement in the project and its development. The group member participated in the project at an inadequate level, attending some meetings and responding to the other members. The student demonstrated an insufficient commitment to work towards achieving the project goals and meeting the deadline.	The submission demonstrates unsatisfactory engagement in the project and its development. The group member participated in the project at an inadequate level, attending few to no meetings and rarely responding to the other members. The student demonstrated an insufficient commitment to work towards achieving the project goals and meeting the deadline.	No contribution.
Criteria	80+	70-79	60-69	50-59	40-49	30-39	0-29