

**UNIVERSITY OF PLYMOUTH  
SCHOOL OF MARINE SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING**

**PROJECT MARKING SCHEME**

Course: ..... Academic Year : 20

Project Title: .....

Student: ..... Supervisor: ..... Moderator .....

SECTION	MARKING CRITERIA	MARKS
Project Specification	To assess feasibility of project deliverables, literature review, theory and methods, investigation approach and plan of work by Supervisor	/5
Initial Appraisal by Project Moderator and External Examiner	To assess the logbook provided by the student and the initial progress in meeting the aims of the project. To give feedback to student on progress and interpretation of project requirements via Interview	/5
Final Report (Marking Scheme Overleaf)	To assess project coverage as titled, rational, knowledge and understanding, and methodology	/60
	To assess analytical and technical content input by student including quality of discussion.	
Work/Project Logbook	To assess general presentation and quality of synopsis, conclusion and recommendations	/15
	To assess the degree to which the student took ownership of the project, displaying enthusiasm and flair and accounting for the quantity of work done and quality of organisation of work over the project duration, including personal interaction with supervisor and technician.	
	To assess engineering skills content, i.e. experimental ability, computing and CAE use, etc.	
Projects Open Day Poster	To assess quality of the poster presentation by Supervisor	/5
Project Poster Oral Presentation	Project mini viva by Moderator	/10
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>/100</b>

Final Mark Agreed :- .....

Supervisor (to sign): ..... Internal Moderator: .....

# Project Final Report Marking Criteria

	Available marks	Unsatisfactory <40%	Below Average 40-49%	Satisfactory 50-59%	Very Good 60-69%	Excellent 70+ %	
Rationale/Literature review	0-10	Problem statement severely underdeveloped, Absent of focus; task unclear / confused. No attempt at critical comment; Serious gaps and omissions in literature.	Marginal focus. Relevance of topic explained; problem statement poorly developed; Little attempt at critical comment; Large gaps and omissions in literature.	Task definition could improve; some shortcomings in clarity of purpose and associated objectives. Satisfactory knowledge; Some gaps and omissions in review. Some attempt at critical comment.	Subject valid and relevant. Appropriate rationale. Task clear and explicit. Scope for study appropriate. Focus maintained on issue. Sound knowledge and good understanding of subject area. Some critical review.	Clear statement of problem and associated objectives. Persuasive and comprehensive rationale. Task demanding and original. Full critical review of literature relevant to study. Comprehensive knowledge	
Methodology	0-10	No justification for selected methodology. Inadequate data collection. No understanding of methodology and implication.	Little justification for selected methodology. Inappropriate methods selected. Poor understanding of methodology and implication.	Some justification and rationale for methodology. Evidence of basic understanding of values and limitations of methodology. Reasonable methodology selected.	Appropriate selection of and justification for methodology. Appropriate methods used. Clear rationale. More advanced understanding of limitations.	Correct selection of and justification for methodology. Full understanding of values and limitations of method.	
Contents/Knowledge/ Student understanding and coverage of the project as titled	0-10	No understanding of the project matter as titled. Confused conceptual thinking and inadequate knowledge.	Little understanding of the project matter as titled. Conceptual framework incomplete. Inappropriate use of data, information and knowledge.	Evidence of some understanding of the tasks and adequate coverage of the project issues. Relevant and reasonable conceptual framework.	Good knowledgeable account of the project as titled. Ample coverage of the subject matter in sufficient technical detail.	Excellent understanding and insight knowledge of the subject matter. Conceptual framework underpins study. Comprehensive expert account of topic.	
Critical analysis, examination and discussions/ Use of evidence	0-10	Weak and unacceptable analysis; Inadequate use of evidence for discussion; No critical evaluation of results.	Limited or logically inconsistent analysis. Superficial critical evaluation of results or value of evidence.	Appropriate analysis but limited. Limited critical awareness results. Clear presentation of findings.	Clear presentation of findings. Competent analysis. Evidence of ability to evaluate results.	High level analysis using appropriate techniques. Critical competence. Strong evidence base.	
Conclusions and/or recommendations.	0-10	Absent conclusions. No recommendations	Relatively deficient and unsupported conclusions – evidential or logical or both.	Clear presentation of conclusions related to evidence. Results mostly linked to objectives of study.	Logical conclusions predominantly based on evidence. Evidence of ability to critically evaluate. Results linked consistently to objectives	Clear presentation of fully justified findings. Logical conclusions based on research evidence. Critical competence.	
Structure and presentation	0-10	Unacceptable layout in terms of structure and logical argument. Inappropriate use of English. Serious deficiencies in presentation.	Poor layout in terms of structure and logical argument. Poor literacy style and deficiencies in presentation.	Generally good layout. Conforms to appropriate length, literacy style. Mainly appropriate presentation. Relevant use of appendices. Adequate expression.	Correct, clear English. Clear and competent expression. Correct reference to sources and inclusion of a full bibliography. Consistent layout of the project report.	Excellent layout. Conforms to all technical specifications. Lucid style of expression in English. Appropriate and innovate presentation.	
Overall Mark for Final Report	/60	Additional comments for markers/Supervisors.					