

Final Year Project Assessment Matrix

B2 Final Report

Student Name _____ Assessor _____ Date _____
 Supervisor Co-supervisor

Research Process	Facet	F	P	C	D	HD
		<i>Fails to satisfy the minimum requirements</i>	<i>Satisfies the minimum requirements</i>	<i>Demonstrates a high level of understanding and presentation and a degree of originality and insight</i>	<i>A very high standard of work which demonstrates originality and insight</i>	<i>Outstanding or exceptional work in terms of understanding, interpretation and presentation</i>
A. Students embark on inquiry* and so determine a need for knowledge / understanding (10%)	Objectives stated	Unclear or inappropriate	Clear but lacks focus	Clear and focussed	Clear, focussed and innovative	Clear, focussed, innovative, open inquiry
	Context of project: background and relevant works	Not described/surveyed/analysis	Minimally described/surveyed/analysis	Satisfactorily described/surveyed. Some analysis	Informative, well-researched & analysed	Comprehensive, extensively re-searched & analysed
B. Students find/generate needed information / data / ideas using appropriate approach / method (20%)	Technical challenges	Vaguely specified	Clearly identified	Clearly identified and explained	Clearly identified, explained in context	Clearly identified, explained in context and justified
	References and citations	Minimal use of or inappropriate sources	Few appropriate sources	Several appropriate sources	Numerous appropriate sources	Numerous appropriate and wide range of sources
C. Students critically evaluate information / data / ideas, their approach and results, and react appropriately (20%)	Project significance, (including broader (social/cultural) implications	Not discussed	Minimal discussion or evidence of understanding	Some evidence of understanding; reasonably considered	Strong evidence of understanding; mostly considered	Exceptionally strong evidence of understanding; fully considered
	Strengths and weaknesses of project approach	Not discussed	Minimally discussed	Moderately explored and analysed	Well explored and analysed	Comprehensively explored and critically analysed
	Technical Approach	Minimal discussions	Adequate discussions	Detailed discussions	Highly detailed discussions	Highly detailed discussions and shows originality
	Technical Reasoning	Lacks justification	Minimal justification	Sound justification	Extensive justification	Extensive justification, and shows strong insight
D. Students perform necessary processes to meet stated project objectives (20%)	Technical merit of project	Little or none	Minimal	Average	High	Very high and beyond expectations
	Reported progress	Insufficient, not satisfactory relative to plan	Barely satisfactory relative to plan	Mostly satisfactory relative to plan	Highly satisfactory relative to plan	Beyond expectations set out in plan
	Reported project outcomes	Do not meet expectations	Meet some expectations	Meet most expectations	Meet all expectations	Exceed expectations
	Professional competence	Not demonstrably competent	Basic competence	Competent	Highly competent	Highly competent, beyond expectations
E. Students organize themselves effectively and adequately manage human input to project (10%)	Review of group roles and team organisation	Not specified	Roles reviewed but no reason provided	Roles reviewed with reasons provided	Roles reviewed with reasons provided; leading to an effective team	Roles reviewed with reasons provided; leading to an outstanding team
	Team management strategy	Not discussed	Discussed but strategy is superficial	Discussed; strategy is demonstrably effective	Discussed in detail, strategy is likely to be effective	Discussed in detail, strategy is likely to be effective and innovative
F. Students communicate project objectives, achievements and the process (20%)	Writing style (includes spelling/ grammatical issues)	Inappropriate or ineffective	Appropriate but not very effective	Appropriate and effective	Effective & precise , clearly appropriate for discipline	Elegant & precise, strongly appropriate for discipline
	Presentation quality	Poor, disorganised	Adequate, reasonably organised	Fine, well organised	High quality & well organised	Professional quality, publication standard

Mark (out of 10):

Comments:

Comments (continued from page 1):