CE301 Third Year Project

Poster 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 posters there are three attributes to grade against, namely "Appearance (40%)", "Coherence (40%)", and "Technical Content (20%)". 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. Appearance: The student is aiming to produce a poster that has an appearance that is pleasing, uncluttered, and with a style that is appropriate to the subject matter. The student should not interfere with the header of the template containing the University logo and the name of the School. The choice of typeface that is used for the title within the header is at the discretion of the student. Figures and graphs should have appropriate captions and all graphs should be clearly labelled with axis and units.
2. Coherence: The student is aiming to produce a poster that is coherent with the flow of information clear and appropriate.
3. Quality of the technical content: The student is aiming to draw out the significant technical aspects of the project, making them clear and understandable to a non technical reader without the need for clarification by the student. The poster should aim to inform and induce debate.

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
Poster Appearance (40%)	A poster appearance with no flaws and would be suitable for external publication.	A poster appearance that is excellent in quality but requiring minor changes.	A poster appearance that is very good but with some aspects that require redesigning.	A poster appearance that is good but would require several changes.	A satisfactory poster appearance but requiring significant changes.	The poster exhibits weaknesses that mean it is not at a level suitable for display.	The poster has major weaknesses that led to the inability to print and/or display it.
Coherence of Poster Content (40%)	The poster is coherent to an outstanding degree making the poster clear and readable without guidance.	An excellent degree of coherence with only minor points of clarification required from the presenter.	A very good coherent poster with some clarifications needed by the presenter.	A good coherent poster but requiring clarification of several points.	A satisfactory poster that could be understood with significant contribution from the presenter.	A poster requiring significant imput from the presenter after which there was still incoherence.	A poster that failed to be printed and/or displayed but a coherence grade was possible from the electronic version.
Quality of Technical Content (20%)	Outstanding technical content demonstrating the student had understood and was able to communicate the technical content.	Excellent technical content with some minor weaknesses in either presentation or explanation.	Very good technical content with some areas of weakness of description or verbal communication.	Good technical content with several areas of some concern regarding description or communication.	Satisfactory technical content but with errors in the written description and/or the attempt to clarify by the presenter.	Weak technical content below the level required for a final year project.	A poster that failed to be printed and/or displayed but a technical grade could be assigned.