

This rubric is a sample provided by the Department of Electrical Engineering (PolyU)

Rubric for Final Report Assessment

	Unacceptable (0-1.75)	Satisfactory (1.76-2.75)	Good (2.76-3.75)	Excellent (3.76-4.5)
Abstract & introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Irrelevant to the project Confusing and self-contradicting descriptions Introduction extremely underdeveloped or missing Aims and objectives are not stated Rationale for carrying out the project is unclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Give a rough overview of the project, some points are unclear Most information is presented in a logical order that is easy to follow. Aims and objectives are stated but the rationale for carrying out the project is not explained clearly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Give a clear overview of the project Effective introduction brings audience to topic Aims and objectives are clearly stated Identification of problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Give a very effective overview of the project Highly effective introduction brings audience to topic Aims and objectives are explicitly stated Identification of problems Rationale for carrying out the project is explained clearly
Literature Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No or irrelevant literature review Review of literature is presented but not in a logical manner The work of others is not acknowledged and referenced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literature review is relevant and consistent with the research topic Literatures are evaluated though original thinking is not evident Review of literature is presented in a logical but sometimes not coherent manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thorough, relevant and consistent with the research topic Literatures are evaluated; original thinking is evident to some degrees Review of literature is presented in a logical and coherent manner The work of others is acknowledged and referenced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thorough, comprehensive, relevant and consistent with the research topic Literatures are critically evaluated; original thinking is evident Review of literature is presented in a logical and coherent manner The work of others is acknowledged and referenced Source material is up to date and comprehensive

	Unacceptable (0-1.75)	Satisfactory (1.76-2.75)	Good (2.76-3.75)	Excellent (3.76-4.5)
Methodology and technical skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research problem cannot be comprehended • Work scope is either unrealistic and not justifiable • Do not aware of various possible investigative methods • No progress in solving the problem • Engineering analysis infrequently used or appears trivial and leads to obvious conclusions • No or very poor technical (software /hardware/mathematical) skills are demonstrated during the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research problem under study is described • Some research methods are used to solve the problem and the problem is partly solved • Included some analysis; but some steps seem not supported by calculation • Basic technical (software /hardware/ mathematical) skills are demonstrated during the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Causes of the problem under study can be fully explained; The pros and cons of each proposed solution found in the literature can also be explained • Suitable research methods are used to solve the problem and the problem is reasonably solved • Detailed & challenging engineering analysis; but a few steps seem not supported by calculation • Good technical (software /hardware/ mathematical) skills are demonstrated during the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The problem under study is fully analyzed with solution being proposed • Suitable research methods are used to solve the problem and the problem is fully solved • Detailed & challenging engineering analysis at every stage of the design process • Excellent technical (software/hardware/ mathematical) skills are demonstrated during the project

	Unacceptable (0-1.75)	Satisfactory (1.76-2.75)	Good (2.76-3.75)	Excellent (3.76-4.5)
Results, Discussions & conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of test conditions and test data • No explanation about any discrepancy between theoretical and experimental results • Lack of results • No conclusions or wrong conclusions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basically clear presentation of test conditions and test data • For many discrepancies between theoretical and experimental results, an analysis is done to explain it • Results supported by full documentation • Results are interpreted but do not have consistent focus on the aim • Conclusions addresses the research question/issue and some of the aims and objectives are achieved • Conclusions are drawn from analysis and are partially supported by data • Recommendations for future development are somewhat unrealistic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear presentation of test conditions and test data • For any discrepancy between theoretical and experimental results, an analysis is done to explain it • Results supported by full documentation • Results are interpreted with consistent focus on the aim • Conclusion addresses the research question/issue and achievement of aim and objectives • Conclusions are drawn from analysis and are mostly supported by data • Clear understanding of the potentials • Realistic recommendations for future development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear presentation of test conditions and test data • For any discrepancy between theoretical and experimental results, an analysis is done to explain it • Results supported by full documentation • Results are effectively interpreted with consistent focus on the aim • Interpretation are well-integrated into existing literature • Output having the potential for academic publication • Conclusion addresses the research question/issue and achievement of aim and objectives • Conclusions are drawn from analysis and are fully supported by data • Clear understanding of the potentials • State limitations of final product • Realistic recommendations for future development
Overall Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disorganized to the extent preventing understanding. • Full of misspellings and/or grammatical errors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most information is presented in logical order which is easy to follow. • Some misspellings and/or grammatical errors. • Presentation of charts, diagrams, tables and references is sometimes improper or erroneous • Layout, format and outline of the report are sometimes inconsistent with the requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organization is generally good, but some parts seem out of place • Minor misspellings and/or grammatical errors. • Layout, format and outline of the report are mostly consistent with the requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written work is well organized and easy to understand • Free from spelling mistake and grammatical error • Layout, format and outline of the report are consistent with the requirements • Proper presentation of charts, diagrams, tables and references