ELEC6200 GDP Marking Scheme

I. Group report - ≤ 75% of assessment

The general distribution of group report marks is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group contribution</th>
<th>Individual contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report writing aspects</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical and management aspects</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examiners may, at their discretion, modify or set aside the distribution of marks but should assess the group and differentiate students according to the guidelines below.

Mark ranges and letter grades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>90% - 100% A*</th>
<th>80% - 89% A+</th>
<th>70% - 79% A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Second</td>
<td>60% - 69% B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Second</td>
<td>50% - 59% C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>40% - 49% D</td>
<td>31% - 39% E</td>
<td>0% - 29% F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical contribution and management aspects

1. Challenge/approach

A* Publishable/patentable approach, thoroughly tested, evidence of customer satisfaction.
A+ Innovative approach, thoroughly tested, evidence of customer satisfaction.
A Excellent design and implementation, thorough testing, evidence of customer satisfaction.
B Good design and implementation, thorough testing.
C Adequate design and implementation, satisfactory testing.
D Adequate design and implementation, some gaps in testing.
E Poor design and implementation, some evidence of testing.
F Unsatisfactory design, implementation, and testing.

2. Planning, progress

A* Excellent planning and progress, team worked independently, optimal use of team’s skills.
A+ Very good planning and progress, team worked independently, very good use of team’s skills.
A Good planning and progress, hardly any guidance needed, good use of team’s skills.
B Good planning and progress, with some guidance needed, satisfactory use of team’s skills.
C The team worked steadily, with some guidance needed.
D The team worked steadily, needing considerable guidance.
E The team managed some work together, needing considerable guidance.
F The team did not work together, despite considerable guidance.

3. Achievement and results

A* Very challenging project, met all goals, ready to be used.
A+ Challenging project, met all goals, ready to be used.
A Challenging project, met all major goals, worthy of being used.
B Met most major goals, probably worth using.
C Met some of the major goals, possibly worth using.
D Met some goals, further work needed.
E Met a few goals, major work needed.
F Did not meet the goals, not worth using.
Report writing aspects

A* Extremely well written, structured and formatted, no spelling or grammatical errors; Extensive review of related work and references; References relate both to academic and industrial work; Coherent, stimulating and clear presentation.
A+ Very well written, structured and formatted, few spelling or grammatical errors; Review of related work, range of references including journal articles and industrial publications; Very good, coherent, confident and clear presentation of the results.
A Very well written, structured and formatted, review of related work including research papers. Coherent and clear presentation.
B Well written, structured and formatted, review of related work, references to material used. A solid report.
C Adequately written, structured & formatted, some background reading and references.
D Adequately written, some background reading, some errors in structure/format/contents
E Poorly written and structured report; Results not clearly presented; Little evidence of background reading, poor referencing.
F No, or badly written report.

Individual aspects of the group work are assessed according to the following criteria.

Personal contribution

1. Individual evaluation and reflection
A* Justified evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the team, process, design, and results
A+ Justified evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the process, design, and results
A Justified evaluation of the strengths or weaknesses of the process, design, and results
B Clear understanding of the strengths or weaknesses of the design, and results
C Some understanding of the strengths or weaknesses of the design and results
D A little understanding of the strengths or weaknesses of the design or results
E Weak understanding of the strengths or weaknesses of the design or results
F No understanding of the strengths or weaknesses of the design or results

2. Personal technical contribution
A* Leading contribution to the achievement of the team, clear evidence of original thinking, considerable knowledge and understanding and ability to face considerable challenge
A+ Key contribution to the achievement of the team, evidence of original thinking, extensive knowledge and ability to face considerable challenge
A Essential contribution to the achievement of the team, evidence of original thinking, knowledge and ability to face difficult challenge
B High quality contribution to the achievement of the team, appreciation of the challenge, ability to identify and address novel aspects.
C Adequate contribution to the achievement of the team, evidence of good work but needed more than the usual level of guidance from supervisor or peers.
D Some contribution to the achievement of the team but substantially guided by supervisor or peers.
E Inadequate contribution; needing extensive guidance.
F No contribution, little evidence of technical results despite extensive guidance.

3. Personal contribution to the final presentation and demonstrations
A* Confident and stimulating presentation demonstrating command of the project.
A+ Confident and clear presentation demonstrating command of the project.
A Clear presentation demonstrating good understanding of the project.
B Clear presentation demonstrating adequate understanding of the project.
C Adequate presentation and understanding.
D Weak presentation or understanding.
II. **Group final presentation and poster – ≥ 5% of assessment**

A* Confident, stimulating and clear presentation; presentation shows ample evidence of realistic planning, cohesion of the team, appropriate use of available expertise in the team; evidence of very good relationship with the customer, evidence of negotiation skills.

A+ Confident and clear presentation; presentation shows evidence of good planning, team cohesion, appropriate use of available expertise in the team; evidence of very good relationship with the customer, evidence of negotiation skills.

A Clear presentation demonstrating good understanding of the project; presentation shows evidence of planning, team cohesion, appropriate use of available expertise in the team; evidence of interaction with the customer, evidence of negotiation skills.

B Clear presentation demonstrating adequate understanding of the project; evidence of challenge, but goal or work carried out were not fully presented; evidence of group cooperation generally adequate but presentation driven mostly by one or two individuals.

C Adequate presentation and understanding; goal and work carried out were not fully presented; some evidence of group cohesion but presentation was driven by one or two individuals.

D Weak presentation or understanding; evidence of work attempted but not adequately presented.

E Inadequate presentation, evidence of poor understanding; it is not clear how the group tackled the problem and how they managed their time, evidence of deficient team work.

F Clearly inadequate presentations.

III. **Individual Reflection Report on Group Work – ≥ 5% of assessment**

A* Justified evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the team, process, design, and results

A+ Justified evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the process, design, and results

A Justified evaluation of the strengths or weaknesses of the process, design, and results

B Clear understanding of the strengths or weaknesses of the design, and results

C Some understanding of the strengths or weaknesses of the design and results

D A little understanding of the strengths or weaknesses of the design or results

E Weak understanding of the strengths or weaknesses of the design or results

F No understanding of the strengths or weaknesses of the design or results

1. **Oral presentations, seminars, demonstrations**

A* Confident, stimulating and clear presentations; presentations show ample evidence of realistic planning, cohesion of the team, appropriate use of available expertise in the team; evidence of very good relationship with the customer, evidence of negotiation skills.

A+ Confident and clear presentations; presentations show evidence of good planning, team cohesion, appropriate use of available expertise in the team; evidence of very good relationship with the customer, evidence of negotiation skills.

A Clear presentations demonstrating good understanding of the project; presentations show evidence of planning, team cohesion, appropriate use of available expertise in the team; evidence of interaction with the customer, evidence of negotiation skills.

B Clear presentations demonstrating adequate understanding of the project; evidence of challenge, but goal or work carried out were not fully presented; evidence of group cooperation generally adequate but presentations driven mostly by one or two individuals.
C Adequate presentations and understanding; goal and work carried out were not fully presented; some evidence of group cohesion but presentations were driven by one or two individuals.

D Weak presentations or understanding; evidence of work attempted but not adequately presented.

E Inadequate presentations, evidence of poor understanding; it is not clear how the group tackled the problem and how they managed their time, evidence of deficient team work.

F Clearly inadequate presentations.

2. Report structure, grammar, spelling

A* Extremely well written and structured report, no spelling or grammatical errors; stimulating and clear presentations.

A+ Very well written and structured report, few spelling or grammatical errors; confident and clear presentations.

A Well written and structured report, few spelling or grammatical errors; clear presentations demonstrating good understanding of the project.

B Well written report, few spelling or grammatical errors; clear presentations demonstrating adequate understanding of the project.

C Well written report, some spelling or grammatical errors; adequate presentations and understanding.

D Reasonably written report; weak presentations or understanding.

E Inadequately written report, could still be understood; weak presentations and understanding.

F It was difficult to understand the report; clearly inadequate presentations.

IV. Individual Report on Business and Technology – 15% of assessment

A* Excellent, professional and stimulating report, no errors, clear presentation; abstract and conclusion carefully worded giving a precise description; Clear reference to presentations with considered and well thought out hypotheses, referring to multiple examples; excellent and relevant evidence provided to support hypotheses; excellent critical evaluation of evidence, including evidence from most of external speakers; relevant high quality references

A+ Very good, professional and stimulating report, no errors, clear presentation; abstract and conclusion carefully worded giving an excellent description; Clear reference to presentations with considered and well thought out hypotheses, referring to at least two examples; very good, relevant evidence provided to support hypotheses; very good critical evaluation of evidence, including evidence from most of the external speakers; relevant high quality references

A Very good, professional and interesting report, no errors, clear presentation; abstract and conclusion carefully worded giving a very good description; Clear reference to presentations with well thought out hypotheses, referring to at least two examples; good, relevant evidence provided to support hypotheses; good critical evaluation of evidence, including evidence from some of the external speakers; relevant, mostly high quality references

B Very good, professional report, very few errors, clear presentation; abstract and conclusion carefully worded giving a good description; Clear reference to presentations with well thought out hypotheses, referring to at least one example; good, relevant evidence provided to support hypotheses; good evidence of some critical evaluation, including evidence from at least two of the external speakers; relevant, mostly high quality references supporting some of the key points

C Good, professional report, some errors and typos, mainly clear presentation with most key points correctly identified; abstract and conclusion giving a reasonable description; Some references to presentations with reasonable hypotheses, referring to at least one example; evidence provided to support most hypotheses; some evidence of critical evaluation, including evidence from at least one of the external speakers; some relevant references, not all web-sites, supporting some of the key points

D An adequate report containing some errors and typos resulting in some points not being clear, some key points correctly identified; abstract and conclusion giving a reasonable description but
may miss some key findings; Some references to presentations but with little hypothesis to support
an argument, referring to at least one example; little evidence provided to support hypothesis; little
evidence of critical evaluation; some relevant references, not all web-sites.
E An inadequate report containing significant errors and typos resulting in little clarity, very few or
no key points identified; abstract and conclusion poor, not reflecting the report content; No or poor
references to presentations and no real hypothesis presented, inadequate example; no critical
evaluation; few or no references of any relevance.
F Generally poor report with no structure, content not relevant, no examples and no critical
evaluation; no hypothesis or argument presented.
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