|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Poor | Adequate | Good | Excellent |
| Prototype Functionality  (20%) | Barely functional prototype that doesn’t clearly meet the aims set out in the project. Major issues with functionality.  0 - 7 | Reasonable attempt at a prototype to meet the stated aims. Most of the major functionality present. Some issues.  8 - 11 | Functional prototype. May have some issues with reliability of consistency. May not fully meet all stated aims, but a good attempt.  12 - 17 | Fully functional prototype that achieves all the stated aims and works reliably and consistently  18 - 20 |
| Engineering Quality  (10%) | For Software: Poorly coded, or seems to be almost directly taken from tutorials or examples. Little or no commenting.  For Hardware: poorly built, fragile, easily broken.  0 - 3 | For software: Code structure could be better. Some issues with logic in places. Some comments, but do not clearly explain important parts of code. Little or no reference to external resources/tutorials/libraries  For hardware: reasonably built. Parts fit together. Somewhat robust.  4 - 6 | For software: Well-written code. No major issues with code structure or logic. Code is commented well. External resources/libraries/tutorials used are clearly referenced.  For hardware: Well built. Parts have obviously been designed to work together. Product is robust, reliable.  7 - 8 | For software: Well-written code following best practices. Well documented.  For hardware: product has been engineered well. Reliable, robust, well-designed and constructed. Almost production quality.  9 - 10 |
| Design Process  (15%) | Little or no indication that a design process was followed, but rather that something was just built.  0 - 5 | Basic documentation of the design process with some sketches/diagrams/mockups/etc.  6 - 9 | Multiple stages of the design process have been documented. Some use of sketches/diagrams/  mockups/etc. Some flow to the design process but not completely clear how each stage led to the next.  10 - 13 | Design process is very well documented. Clear explanation of each stage of the design, illustrated with sketches/diagrams/  mockups/etc. Each stage follows logically from the other. End result is a well-designed prototype.  14 - 15 |
| Implementation Process  (15%) | Little or no description of the implementation process. Implementation made use of the first potential solution come across with minimal consideration of options. No discussion of issues.  0 - 5 | Some description of the implementation process that shows at least a consideration of the major tools to be used. At least one interesting issue/problem discussed.  6 - 9 | Implementation process is illustrated with code samples and discussion. Evidence of consideration of options at different stages. Some discussion of interesting issues/problems.  10 - 13 | Clear discussion of the process taken. Good examples of how tricky problems were solved. Shows detailed consideration of a range of potential solutions to each problem.  14 - 15 |
| Report  (10%) | Little or no detail in the report. Structure is poor. Does not explain how you arrived at the delivered prototype.  0 - 3 | Reasonable report. Readable. Missing details on important aspects of the process.  4 - 6 | Good report. Understandable, with logical structure. Detailed discussion of the prototype and process that led to it. External material referenced correctly. Points illustrated with examples.  7 - 8 | Clear, well-written, well-structured report. All aspects of the prototype and process are clearly documented.  9 - 10 |