

EEE4022F/S FYP - Rubric

Criteria	0-39 %	40 to 49% Unacceptable	50% to 59% Acceptable	60% to 69% Good	70% to 74% Very Good	75% to 85% Excellent	86% to 100% Outstanding
a) Problem statement & literature review: Was the research question / engineering problem clearly formulated and achievable? Did the student understand the nature of the investigation? Is the literature covered, relevant, thorough, pertinent, of good quality and suitably extensive?		Poorly formulated research question/ engineering problem. Fragmented, incomplete and unclear research question/engineering problem. Superficial discussion and/or no academic sources.	Not completely clear; but reasonable attempt at formulating achievable question/ problem. Relevance and engagement in part but remains unfocused, unclear link to question/problem, literature missing and/ or unreliable.	Good question/problem formulation but verbose and beyond scope of report. Reasonably relevant, linked to question/problem, some important literature covered.	Clear question/problem formulation but perhaps not achievable within the report scope. Relevant, linked to question/problem, majority of important literature covered. Clear and achievable question/problem concisely stated.	Mastery in question/problem formulation - strongly crafted within achievable scope of report. Strong relevance linking literature to question/problem and comprehensive coverage of the important literature.	Original, engaging, and thought provoking research question/engineering problem. Critical engagement with literature. Relevant, supports question/problem, covers all aspects, credible sources used.
b) Design and Theory Is there clear development of theory? Is the design well described? Is the description clear enough to allow another student to duplicate it? Does the understanding of the theory inform the design of the project.		Very little understanding, poor application of theory.	Some discussion of method and limitations. Incomplete theory development and design description.	Partial discussion of method and limitations, some theory development. Weak design description.	Satisfactory discussion of method, some limitations, and justification for using method in terms of question/problem. Solid design description	Thorough discussion of method and limitations. Good theory development and complete design description for replication.	Creative development of methodology/theory which progresses method in the field. Meticulous care in design description.
c) Practical work, simulation and software How much practical work has been done? How relevant was it to the topic? Were the procedures verified, either by experiments or clear reasoning?		Inadequate practical work done i.t.o. quantity and quality.	Barely adequate in terms of either quantity or quality, some useful content.	Adequate in terms of quantity and/or quality but fails to address questions/problem fully.	Suitable practical work done which addresses research questions convincingly.	Thorough practical work done which fully covers question /problem.	Exceptional rigour demonstrated in practical work.
d) Results: Interpretation and conclusions Are the results interpreted clearly? Are the conclusions reached clearly supported in the results and linked to the research question/engineering problem? Are suggestions made for further research?		Superficial and/or irrelevant analysis. Little or no synthesis of information, no link to research questions/problem, no suggestions for future research.	Little synthesis of information, some interpretation, but poor link to research questions.	Some interpretation which partially answers research question/engineering problem. Some weakness in summary of results and suggestions for future research.	Good attempt, but some conclusions absent or not fully supported. Adequate analysis which covers basics of research questions/engineering problem. Some suggestions for further research/work.	Accurate analysis, drawing out features of the data and speaking to research questions/engineering problem. Good suggestions for further research.	Creative analysis which draws out pertinent solutions to research questions /problem & highlights additional features. Succinct and precise conclusions. Useful and creative suggestions for future research offered.
f) Presentation, layout, referencing Is the report done in a professional way? Is the use of grammar acceptable? Is the material properly referenced?		Unprofessional work. Poor grammar. Refs missing, poor understanding of citation conventions.	Problems with layout, careless grammar errors. Presentation unsatisfactory. Some facts not referenced.	Layout and presentation could be improved. Referencing sometimes patchy, mistakes made with grammar.	Layout and presentation acceptable. A few minor errors in grammar and referencing.	Very few, if any, errors in citations. Care demonstrated with grammar, layout and presentation.	No errors in referencing and grammar. Presentation and layout thoughtful and professional.