CE301 Third Year Project
Demonstration and Oral Examination Marking 2010-11

Introduction

Final year project assessment elements will now be graded using a set of descriptors against each attribute associated with the assessment. For the final reports there are three attributes to grade against, namely "Clarity of Demonstration and Presentation (25%)", "Technical Achievement Level of Demonstration (25%)", "Technical Quality of Verbal Responses (25%)", and "Communication Quality of Verbal Responses (25%)". The grading table below gives a range of descriptors from "Outstanding" to "Significant Weaknesses". For each of the three attributes supervisors and second assessors should choose the descriptor that most closely matches the students work. After grading the work independently the supervisor and second assessor should meet and consolidate their grades for each attribute, choosing only one descriptor for each attribute to return to the student (see example below the grading table).

Attributes

1. Clarity of Demonstration and Presentation: The student is aiming to give a clear and complete demonstration/presentation. The major aspects of the project should be presented and demonstrated to confirm the students understanding and achievement.

2. Technical Achievement Level of Demonstration: The technical content and level should be made clear in the demonstration. Supervisors and second assessors should grade high when the technical description and level are both considered to be of a high standard.

3. Technical Quality of Verbal Responses: On questioning the student supervisors and second assessors should judge the technical quality of the verbal responses.

4. Communication Quality of Verbal Responses: Students should be able to respond to questioning in a clear and precise manner.

Grades below 40% should indicate that the student has fallen below the standard required to pass the attribute.

Grades at the highest level should be awarded in exceptional circumstances to very high quality 1st class Honours standard work.

Grading Table

Attribute	Outstanding	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Minor Weaknesses	Significant Weaknesses
	>90	70-89	60-69	50-59	40-49	30-39	<30
Clarity of Demonstration and Presentation (25%)	The clarity of the presentation and demonstration was outstanding.	The clarity of the presentation and demonstration was excellent.	The clarity of the presentation and demonstration was very good.	The clarity of the presentation and demonstration was good.	The clarity of the presentation and demonstration was satisfactory.	The clarity of the presentation and demonstration had weaknesses leading to a failing grade.	The clarity of the presentation and demonstration had significant weaknesses leading to grade well below passing standard.
Technical Achievement Level of Demonstration (25%)	The technical achievement and level of the demonstration was outstanding.	The technical achievement and level of the demonstration was excellent.	The technical achievement and level of the demonstration was very good.	The technical achievement and level of the demonstration was good.	The technical achievement and level of the demonstration was satisfactory.	The technical achievement and level of the demonstration had weaknesses leading to a failing grade.	The technical achievement and level of the demonstration had weaknesses leading to a grade well below passing standard.
Communication Quality of Verbal Responses (25%)	The communication quality of the verbal responses was outstanding.	The communication quality of the verbal responses was excellent.	The communication quality of the verbal responses was very good.	The communication quality of the verbal responses was good.	The communication quality of the verbal responses was satisfactory.	The communication quality of the verbal responses was weak leading to a failing grade.	The communication quality of the verbal responses was of a standard well below the passing grade.
Technical Quality of Verbal Responses (25%)	The technical quality of the verbal responses was outstanding.	The technical quality of the verbal responses was excellent.	The technical quality of the verbal responses was very good.	The technical quality of the verbal responses was good.	The technical quality of the verbal responses was satisfactory.	The technical quality of the verbal responses was weak leading to a failing grade.	The technical quality of the verbal responses was significantly weak leading to a grade well below passing standard.