EEE/ISE Individual Project Assessment: Final Report & Project Work Guidelines
Note - Comments should support the marks allocated.

The Project Marksheet requires you to grade a project under the following categories: **Background**, **Competence**, **Achievement** and **Report**. Here is a checklist you should use when assessing each category:

Background (10% weight)
Did the student do their homework? Are they aware of existing work in the area? Do they cit the relevant papers/documents/reports/urls in the report? Do they know why they are doing the work (motivation)? Do they know their target audience or user? Have they been active in formulating project objectives?

Competence (25% weight)
Did they study alternative approaches before embarking on the main activity? Did they use the right tools for the job? Did they show the ability to work independently? Did they show the ability to make things work without constant assistance? Did the ideas (not necessarily those in the original proposal) come from them?

Achievement (30% weight)
[The difficulty of the project in terms of length and breadth should be taken into account here]. Were the major goals met? Did they get further than you might normally have expected? Are the deliverables fully functional or correct? Is the project output technically sound? Is the work properly evaluated (e.g. functionality/performance testing, discussions, tables, graphs, subjective/objective comparisons, user surveys?). Is it (potentially) useful to the target audience? Could it be published in some form? Did the student demonstrate some element of originality or creativity?

Report (30% weight)
Does it contain the main components you expected (e.g. abstract, introduction, background, main body, conclusions, bibliography?) Is the bibliography correctly cited? Is it well laid out? Is it well written? Is it largely free of typos, mistakes and grammatical errors? **[5 out of the 30 marks should be allocated for the above]**. Is it well structured with appropriate introductions and conclusions throughout? Does it describe the motivation for the work? Does it set the scene well in terms of introduction and background? Can you follow what has been done, how and why by reading the main body? Are the results well explained with sufficient interpretation? Are the results appropriately evaluated? Are the strengths and weaknesses presented appropriately? Are there meaningful conclusions and is there a sensible programme of future work? Does it have an appropriate level of detail and is it of an appropriate size?

Project Assessment – Classification Guidelines

As a guideline, the following seeks to describe in very general terms a typical project in each degree classification. Obviously, not all projects will match a single one of these categories – for example an outstanding but low risk project might end up with a 2/1.
Outstanding (85%+)
The project should be mostly high risk and cover significant new ground, or else display unusually high depth and breadth. The project should be evaluated with unusual insight and the contributions of the student should be clearly stated. The report should have very strong technical content presented clearly.
First Class (70%+)
The project should display significant breadth and depth which covers some new ground, e.g. by developing a complex application, algorithm, or hardware which does not already exist, or by enhancing an existing application, method, theory or device in a novel and interesting way. The project should contain elements of high risk and associated problems that arose should have been largely, or completely, overcome using tools and/or techniques appropriate to the job. The work should be well evaluated and it should be clear what the conclusions are.
Upper second (60%-69%)
The project should display a reasonable degree of breadth and depth and should demonstrate a high level of technical competence and professionalism, although the final output might lack elements of novelty, polish, or completeness. There should be some level of risk in that the project was not completely specified at the outset or the work presented difficult challenges that were competently addressed. The completed hardware/software/simulations should be solid in terms of design and correctness.
Lower second (50-59%)
The project should display an ability to solve unambitious, i.e. low-risk, problems competently, the resulting software/hardware should be of at least moderate scope and broadly functional, although it might typically show potential for improvement and/or further development.
Third class (40%-49%)
The project should display the ability to solve a limited number of straightforward, i.e. low-risk, problems completely, though other components of the work may not function correctly or may not have been attempted.
FAIL – projects with less than 40% will fail the student.

B.Eng versus M.Eng.
Markers should note that the total work expected in a passing BEng project is very significantly less than in an M.Eng project because students have less time available project work time, and also one year less prerequisites.