

Project Marking Sheet

Supervisor/2nd Marker: (delete as needed)	Student Name:	Project Title:
---	----------------------	-----------------------

Tick the prompts and use these in deciding a **mark** (a percentage range, eg, 61-64) for each category in the rightmost column. The percentage range should be as small as possible, and never more than 5%.

bad fail (<20)
 fail (20-40)
 3rd (40-50)
 2nd (50-60)
 21 (60-70)
 1st (70-80)
 good 1st (>80)

Poor theory/design/software											A very good product	Quality of product:
Insignificant work completed											Substantial work completed	
No original contribution											Publishable	
Project area not clearly defined											Clear introduction / definition of project	Quality of processes:
Scant analysis of problem / design											Detailed analysis / methodical design	
Poor implementation / testing											Thorough implementation / testing	
Vacuous evaluation of work done											Rigorous critical evaluation	Quality of evaluation:
Poor focus / shallow conclusion											Conclusions summarised with acumen	
Poorly organised report											Sensibly organised subdivided material	Quality of presentation:
Inadequate style / grammar											Flawless grammar	
Poor referencing / tables / diagrams											Relevant, clearly presented, valid material	

Supervisor only:

Required comprehensive instruction											Industrious / independent worker	Student performance:
Unsatisfactory attendance											Attended all scheduled meetings	

General comments: (eg, weak/strong points, justification of final mark in relation to above categories)

Overall mark: (should be a combination of marks above; explain your combination here)

%

Signature and Date:

The marks overleaf fall into the following categories. For each section the relevant descriptions apply.

Bad Fail (<20)	Fail (20 - 40)	3rd (40 - 50)	2/2 (50 - 60)	2/1 (60 - 70)	1st (70 - 80)	High 1st (>80)
Very little work. Poor quality. Shows little understanding of what is required. Poor structure. Poor grammar. Few references. References badly formatted.	Poor accuracy. Little relevance. Unclear arguments. Insufficient evidence of background reading and research.	Mostly satisfactory. Reasonably coherent. Shows basic understanding. Attainable objectives. Adequate software engineering / analytical methods.	Satisfactory to good. Adequate understanding. Clear and attainable objectives. Good software engineering / analytical techniques.	Good to very good work. Broad understanding and good knowledge of subject. Relevant conclusions. Some ability to apply techniques to unfamiliar topics.	Very good to excellent work. Thorough understanding of topic. Good quality critical appraisal. Excellent software engineering / analytical techniques.	Exceptional work. Nearly flawless.