

## Final Report – Project Assessment Criteria- 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Individual Projects (ECM3175 and ECM3149)

Section	Excellent (>80%)	Very Good (70-80%)	Good (55-69%)	Satisfactory (40-54%)	Poor (below 40%)
<b>Abstract (5 Marks)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Background to project</li> <li>• Project aim</li> <li>• Methodologies used</li> <li>• Main outcomes</li> <li>• Conclusions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very well written, accurately and concisely captures all the essential aspects of the project, methodology, outcomes and issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonably well written and captures most of the essential elements of the project, methodology, outcomes and issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequately written and captures most elements methodology, outcomes and issues though missing some information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poorly written and does not clearly convey information concerning project topic, method, issues and/or outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Badly written and/or does not summarise the project topic and its outcomes</li> </ul>
<b>Introduction and background (5 Marks)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What</li> <li>• Why</li> <li>• How</li> <li>• Aim</li> <li>• Objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough and in-depth understanding of the background</li> <li>• Clear, logical and crisp overview of the problem being addressed</li> <li>• Aim and objectives are precise, outlining clearly the what, why and how without leaving room for ambiguities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good, consistent knowledge and understanding of the background</li> <li>• Logical and unambiguous overview of the problem being addressed</li> <li>• Clear, well-defined aim and objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sound, routine knowledge of the problem being addressed</li> <li>• An appropriate overview of the problem being addressed but with minor shortcomings</li> <li>• Aim and objectives are stated but with minor ambiguities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadly accurate understanding of the problem being addressed</li> <li>• Some elements missing and flaws evident</li> <li>• Aim and objectives are given but need much sharpening</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fails to demonstrate a basic understanding of the problem</li> <li>• Reader left confused about the focus of project.</li> <li>• Lacks/badly written aim and objectives</li> </ul>
<b>Literature review (15 Marks)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What has been done before</li> <li>• How it shapes your project</li> <li>• Good referencing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exceptionally wide range of relevant literature used critically to inform argument, balance discussion and/or inform problem-solving.</li> <li>• Consistently accurate use of references.</li> <li>• Shows follow up of most recent advances</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical engagement with appropriate reading.</li> <li>• Knowledge of research-informed literature.</li> <li>• Consistently accurate use of references.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of literature beyond core text(s).</li> <li>• Literature used accurately but descriptively.</li> <li>• Referencing generally sound.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some evidence of reading, with superficial linking to given text(s).</li> <li>• Referencing is largely consistent, but with some weaknesses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of little reading and/or indiscriminate use of sources.</li> <li>• Very few references and/or badly cited.</li> </ul>
<b>Methodology and theory (20 Marks)</b> Elaboration of project-relevant key concepts identified in literature review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent description of the methodology and/or experimental/design procedure</li> <li>• Demonstrates a thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of concepts and theories that goes beyond expectations for this level</li> <li>• Extensive, relevant and logically organised</li> <li>• Shows a good degree of originality/creativity with notable progress beyond background reading</li> <li>• Clear evidence of significant progress towards objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good description of the methodology and/or experimental/design procedure</li> <li>• Good consistent knowledge and understanding of concepts and theories</li> <li>• Relevant and logically organised</li> <li>• Shows some degree of originality with clear and useful progress beyond background reading</li> <li>• Clear evidence of good progress towards stated objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good description of the methodology and/or experimental/design procedure with minor flaws</li> <li>• Sound understanding of concepts and theories</li> <li>• Acceptable coverage</li> <li>• Shows reasonable progress beyond background reading</li> <li>• Evidence of an acceptable level of progress towards stated objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate description of the methodology and/or experimental/design procedure with evident of flaws</li> <li>• Broadly accurate knowledge and understanding of the concepts and theories</li> <li>• Limited coverage</li> <li>• Shows limited progress beyond background reading</li> <li>• Some evidence of progress towards stated objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incomplete/incorrect description of the methodology and experimental/design procedure</li> <li>• Lack of understanding of concepts and theories</li> <li>• Shows no progress beyond background reading</li> <li>• No evidence of progress towards objectives</li> </ul>

## Final Report – Project Assessment Criteria- 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Individual Projects (ECM3175 and ECM3149)

<b>Experimental work /analytical investigation/design (20 Marks)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis, experiments or design (hardware, software, procedures)</li> <li>Design (of equipment or procedure)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent description of how the methodology/experimental work is employed/conducted</li> <li>Can collect and interpret appropriate data/ information and undertake research tasks with autonomy and exceptional success.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good description of how the methodology/experimental work is employed/conducted</li> <li>Can collect and interpret appropriate data and successfully undertake research tasks with a degree of autonomy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An acceptable description of the methodology/experimental work is employed/conducted</li> <li>Can collect and interpret appropriate data/ information and undertake straightforward research tasks with external guidance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited description of the methodology/experimental work is employed/conducted</li> <li>Some evidence of ability to collect appropriate data/information and undertake straightforward research tasks with external guidance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor presentation of the methodology/experimental work is employed/conducted</li> <li>Limited evidence of skills in the range identified for the assessment at this level.</li> <li>Significant weaknesses evident.</li> </ul>
<b>Presentation of experimental or analytical results/description of final constructed product (15 Marks)</b> Exposition of outcomes of the project in the form of a finished product, set of experimental results or outputs from computational or theoretical work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neat, logical and crisp presentation of results as evidence of thorough and detailed work</li> <li>Excellent plots, tables, drawings presented creatively with clear labelling and clear references from text</li> <li>Outcomes self-evident from the presentation without having to explore through text</li> <li>Results show work beyond expectations at this level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear, unambiguous presentation of results as evidence of a good piece of technical work</li> <li>Neat plots, tables, drawings with clear labelling and clear references from text</li> <li>Outcomes self-evident from the presentation without having to explore through text</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technically correct presentation of results but with minor shortcomings</li> <li>Good legible plots, tables, drawings that are neatly linked from the text but with minor flaws</li> <li>Major outcomes are largely evident from the presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Results are given but with some evident gaps</li> <li>Purpose of some plots, tables, drawings etc. is not clear</li> <li>Presentation is not coherent</li> <li>Some conclusions are brought out</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Few results presented</li> <li>Fundamental technical issues present</li> <li>Drawings, tables, plots hard to read</li> <li>Inadequate information to substantiate conclusions</li> </ul>
<b>Discussion and conclusions (10 Marks)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of what has been learnt from experimental/analytical work or design</li> <li>Distillation of important findings and their significance</li> <li>Specific observations to inform future research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent discussion that distils new knowledge from results</li> <li>A concise set of statements of convincing conclusions</li> <li>Clearly defines foundations made for future research or product development</li> <li>Conclusions demonstrate novel and publishable quality work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technically sound discussion highlighting findings from this study with well-balanced arguments.</li> <li>Arguments generally logical, coherently expressed, well organised and supported.</li> <li>Concise set of statements outlining sound conclusions.</li> <li>Clear set of observations to inform future research.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good discussion highlighting the important findings but with minor weaknesses.</li> <li>An emerging awareness of different stances and ability to use evidence to support a coherent argument.</li> <li>Broadly valid conclusions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sense of argument emerging though not completely coherent.</li> <li>Some evidence to support views, but not always consistent.</li> <li>Some relevant conclusions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the most part descriptive with no clarity.</li> <li>Important results not highlighted and views/findings sometimes illogical or contradictory</li> <li>Generalisations/statements made with limited evidence.</li> <li>Conclusions lack relevance and/or validity.</li> </ul>
<b>Project management, consideration of relevant sustainability and health and safety issues where appropriate, overall presentation throughout report (10 Marks)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procedures and systems for project management</li> <li>Sustainability/H&amp;S as appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very well defined how the project was managed.</li> <li>Shows excellent awareness and relevance of health and safety issues,</li> <li>Demonstrates a thorough understanding of sustainability issues and their relevance,</li> <li>Excellent level of English</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly defined how the project was managed,</li> <li>Shows awareness and relevance of health and safety issues,</li> <li>Demonstrates full understanding of sustainability issues and their relevance,</li> <li>Few to no mistakes</li> <li>High standard of English</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sound overall management of project with minor shortcomings</li> <li>Sufficient coverage of health and safety and sustainability issues but few elements missing</li> <li>Good level of English with few minor spelling and grammatical errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable overall level of management however with evident flaws</li> <li>Some coverage of health and safety and sustainability issues with some elements missing</li> <li>Readable but contains some typos and grammatical errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little clarity on what the student did</li> <li>Unconvincing management strategy</li> <li>Does not cover relevant health and safety and sustainability issues</li> <li>Difficult to follow with lots of typos and grammatical mistakes</li> </ul>