Final report – Individual Mark Sheet **ENGG/METR** **Name:**

Grade Band	Problem scope (10)		Approach and reasoning (20)		Analysis (30)	
Excellent (85-100%)	The student clearly understands the problem and what is entailed – not just the what, but the why. The scope is not a description of the problem so much as an identification of the core essence of the engineering dilemma.	10	The student's sub-problem is systematically broken down into its key components. The challenges are distilled into a clearly articulated methodological pathway that demonstrates mastery of the task.	20	The student has relentlessly pursued the design problems, cornered them, and then dispatched them with numbers. They knew it would work before it worked, and then it worked well.	30
Very Good (75-85%)	The student shows clear understanding of what the task entails as an engineering problem. Thorough translation of project into problem space.		The causal relationship of design tasks is clearly called out and ordered. These tasks are then addressed in a systematic way. There is high-level critical thinking evident in the work.		Strong science-based approach. Sane models, simulations or well-justified empirical tests. The student has actually analytically engineered something.	
Good (65-75%)	The project is recognised to be an interconnected network of tasks that must be solved, and the boundary and necessities of these challenges are elicited.		The student has given considerable contemplation to the problem and sought to solve it in a systematic process. Bears the hallmarks of actually thinking it through.		Student has employed numerical approaches to parameterising their design. Much empirical process, but somewhat justified.	
Satisfactory (50-65%)	The student has transmuted the task into a fathomable set of problems to be overcome.		The student thought about what they were doing – possibly in a framework that could be called methodological.		Not hacking – applied some primitive science to the problem. Empirically driven, without process.	
Poor (25-50%)	Some attempt is made at turning the project outline into a problem domain. No evidence of problem comprehension.		There is some abstract notion of a procedural approach. Possibly also the glimmer of applied logic.		Better hacking.	
Very Poor (0-25%)	Little more than regurgitation of the project description.	0	Approach? What approach?	0	Hacking	0

Initial mark: /100	**Comments:**	
Penalties /Bonuses		
Final Mark: /100	**Markers's signature:**	**Date:**

PTO

Grade Band	Design (30)		Report writing skills (10)	
Excellent (85-100%)	The synthesis work is masterful. The design fuses all the objectives in a synergistic and beautiful way. Transcends engineering to become art.	30	Grammar and spelling are perfect. Section has excellent structure and is a pleasure to read. Presentation is neat and professional.	10
Very Good (75-85%)	The student has an obvious grasp of the trade-offs embodied in the design and writes knowledgably of the competing objects they have overcome.		Spelling is perfect, grammar is good. Section has good structure making it easy to comprehend. Presentation is neat and professional.	
Good (65-75%)	The design focusses on the major functional aspects of the design, perhaps at the expense of other features. Not elegant, but functional and robust			
Satisfactory (50-65%)	The design works, but is clunky and lacks the meditation inherent in developing a convergent integrated solution.		Spelling is perfect, but has some grammatical flaws. Section is poorly structured in places but still understandable. Presentation is neat.	
Poor (25-50%)	A mishmash of components thrown together without thought for integration or functional synthesis.		A number of grammatical errors and spelling mistakes. Section lacks structure and is hard to understand. Presentation is untidy.	
Very Poor (0-25%)	No attempt at synthesis step	0		0