

Project Mark Sheet

(to be filled by the academic supervisor)

Grade range (highest to lowest)	A1,A2,A3,A4,A5 (22-18)	B1,B2,B3 (17-15)	C1,C2,C3 (14-12)	D1,D2,D3 (11-9)	E1,E2,E3 (8-6)	F1,F2,F3 (5-3)	G1,G2,G3,H (<3)	Grade awarded
Descriptor	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>G: Very Poor, H: No attainment</i>	
Planning	High-quality planning, made excellent use of time and resources.	Very well planned project, only occasional evidence of deficiencies.	Mostly project was well planned but some deficiencies observed.	Planning was satisfactory generally, but could have been better in some areas.	Poor planning often tending to inefficient use of time and resource.	A disorganised project often lacking focus and direction.	Little or no evidence of any planning.	
Initiative	Made major input to the content and direction of the work; took ownership of the project.	Regularly overcame problems with minimum reliance on supervisor.	Showed moderate levels of initiative by occasionally contributing to project direction.	Overall student required regular assistance and seldom provided any contribution to project.	Student required regular and substantial assistance from supervisor to remain on track.	Student relied heavily on supervisor and contributed little to the project.	Student contributed nothing to the project.	
Professional Conduct	Student exhibited exemplary conduct through punctuality, preparation for meetings and clear communication. Interactions with supervisor and unit's research team were at peer level.	Student exhibited a high standard of conduct through punctuality, preparation for meetings and clear communication. Interactions with supervisor and unit's research team were of a high standard.	Student exhibited an overall good standard of conduct through their punctuality, preparation for meetings and level of communication. Interactions with supervisor and unit's research staff were at a mostly good level.	Student exhibited an overall satisfactory standard of conduct through their punctuality, preparation for meetings and level of communication. Satisfactory interactions with supervisor but perhaps no real engagement with wider research unit.	Student's standard of conduct was weak with broad failings in their punctuality, preparation for meetings and level of communication. Interactions with supervisor were sporadic and superficial.	Student's standard of conduct was poor. Exhibited little attention to punctuality, preparation for meetings and level of communication. Interactions with supervisor were mainly unsatisfactory.	Student's standard of conduct was very poor. Meetings were missed, no reporting on progress and problematic communication. Interactions with supervisor were wholly unsatisfactory.	
Technical Quality of Work	Excellent work of scientific value and of publishable quality. A rigorous treatment of the subject.	High quality work of scientific value but perhaps requiring a level of improvement before being considered to be of publishable quality. A high level of insight as to the tackled problem.	Competent work, results can be trusted but perhaps insufficient insight into problem.	Reasonable quality of work with some level of imperfection, results are mostly trustworthy.	There are some signs of good quality work but overall attainment is at a very modest level.	Very little evidence of final year level work and results may be somewhat dubious.	No output of any value.	

Report Mark Sheet



Grade range (highest to lowest)	A1,A2,A3,A4,A5 (22-18)	B1,B2,B3 (17-15)	C1,C2,C3 (14-12)	D1,D2,D3 (11-9)	E1,E2,E3 (8-6)	F1,F2,F3 (5-3)	G1,G2,G3,H (<3)	Grade awarded
Descriptor	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>G: Very Poor, H: No attainment</i>	0
Writing	Exceptionally clear, precise and concise English. Excellent spelling & grammar, few typos.	Clear and well written, easy to understand, and mostly free of errors.	Most of the text is clear and easily understood. There are some issues with grammar and spelling.	The text can be understood but some elements are not entirely clear. A sizeable volume of errors is noticeable	Hard to understand much of the text. Significant spelling errors and grammatical flaws.	The volume and nature to the grammatical errors, combined with poor writing makes this report difficult to read.	Unintelligible. Impossible to read due to exceptionally poor use of English.	
Presentation and Figures	Professional standard of presentation. All illustrations are well formatted and presented.	A clear and consistent presentation style making it easy to read. Most of the figures are clear and well presented.	There are some minor flaws in the presentation and the clarity of the figures, but overall a well presented report.	A number of basic errors present – inconsistent use of styles, margins etc. Figures are satisfactory	Significant flaws in the presentation detracting from the overall impression of the report. Flawed figures – badly drawn and untidy,	Unacceptable presentation: untidy and inconsistent use of styles. Figures are messy and unclear.	A messy report – no evidence of any effective effort on the quality of the presentation. Report is hard to follow due to unclear figures.	
Organisation and Structure	Structure is entirely correct. All sections are correctly placed of a length that produces a balanced overall document.	A well organised report with all sections logically placed enhancing understanding of work.	A report which is sufficiently well organised to make reading report easy.	There may be some issues with the structure, but these don't detract from overall quality.	There are flaws in the way the report is structured which damages the overall quality of the report.	Serious flaws in structure which makes it difficult to read and understand the report.	No discernable structure. Illogical placement of sections. Impossible to follow argument.	
Technical Content	Well informed and authoritative discussion of a significantly complex technical problem. Excellent breadth and depth of knowledge.	Clear and reasoned arguments indicating a very good grasp of a difficult technical problem.	Arguments presented are of a reasonable technical level, and have been well considered and clearly stated.	The arguments presented are of reasonable technical depth and show a satisfactory understanding.	Only limited critical discussion of the technical problem studied. Suggests limited understanding of problem	Very little evidence of critical discussion of technical work or results. Superficial understanding of problem.	The lack of quality of the technical argument suggests that the student has very little understanding of the problem.	
References	Exemplary range of references from quality sources including peer-reviewed work. Recorded in a consistent and recognised style indicating comprehensive reading. References were used to set the performed work into context.	An appropriate range of references from quality sources including peer-reviewed work. Recorded in a consistent and recognised style suggesting substantial background reading. References perhaps used to provide some sense of context for the performed work.	Sufficient references derived mainly from quality sources including peer-reviewed work. Mainly recorded in a consistent and recognised style.	References provided just enough evidence that some background reading was undertaken. Deficiencies in quality of sources (e.g. not peer-reviewed) or consistency and/or recognised style of recording.	Insufficient number of references of relevance and quality (e.g. not peer-reviewed) to provide evidence of background reading. Perhaps also, significant issues with the style and consistency of recording.	Few references of relevance and quality providing little evidence of background reading. Significant issues with style and consistency of recording.	Very few/no references. No evidence whatsoever of background reading.	

Project Presentation Mark Sheet

Grade range (highest to lowest)	A1,A2,A3,A4,A5 (22-18)	B1,B2,B3 (17-15)	C1,C2,C3 (14-12)	D1,D2,D3 (11-9)	E1,E2,E3 (8-6)	F1,F2,F3 (5-3)	G1,G2,G3,H (<3)	Grade awarded
Descriptor	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>G: Very Poor, H: No attainment</i>	0
Delivery	Confident, clear and unhesitating delivery. Held attention of audience. Easy to follow arguments.	Was confident but perhaps a few minor flaws (such as hesitation, talking too fast etc).	lacking in confidence or possibly not speaking quite clearly enough.	Overall a reasonable delivery but there were issues regarding clarity, or fluency.	A hesitant or unclear delivery made understanding the presentation difficult.	Hesitant, unclear, monotonous, hard to maintain attention. Difficult to follow argument.	No fluency or clarity. Too many basic errors, e.g. mumbling or talking to screen	
Slides/Poster	Exceptionally clear slides. Simple design, large enough font, not too much material on slides. A professional quality presentation.	Clear slides but perhaps the occasional flaw (font size, colour scheme etc) but overall impressive presentation.	There may be a number of errors, on the slides but overall still clear and flaws do not detract significantly from content.	Consistent errors on many slides but not of a significant nature. A reasonable effort but flaws have detracted from presentation.	Significantly flawed slides. Basic errors such as small font size, too much content on slides, over- elaborate design.	Not only are slides poor, but they make it difficult to follow argument.	Very poor slides, basic errors on every slide. Impossible to follow technical argument.	
Technical Content	There is a good quantity of high level technical content in the presentation	Overall, the content is sufficient to give the audience a clear account of a challenging technical task.	The presentation has a good level of technical content with only a small amount of superfluous information.	There is some irrelevant non-pertinent material, but overall the technical content is satisfactory.	The presentation has only limited technical content with too much general background information.	The technical content is relatively low in terms of level and quantity.	Superfluous or possibly no relevant technical content evident.	
Structure/ Layout	Structure of the presentation makes understanding the technical arguments exceptionally clear.	A very well structured presentation with everything where it should be to provide clarity.	Overall a well structured presentation but perhaps one or two slides are misplaced.	Some elements of the presentation are not clear as the structure is slightly confused.	A badly structured presentation giving a confused picture of the project making it difficult to follow arguments.	Although there is some structure to the presentation it is very confused and it is almost impossible to follow.	No discernible attempt at a logical structure.	
Response to Questions	Answered all questions clearly and confidently. Gave the impression of having an excellent grasp of the subject.	Answered all questions competently. Has clearly developed a very good understanding of subject.	Answered most questions well enough to conclude that the student has a developed a good understanding of subject.	Gave some good answers but also some poor ones. Evidence of reasonable understanding of subject.	Answered the majority of the questions poorly suggesting a lack of knowledge in the subject.	Gave some superficial answers but appears to have very little understanding of the subject.	Unable to give any sort of competent answer to any question.	