

Mark Sheet - Engineering / Software / Systems Design Artefact

Student Name:			Student Number:			Supervisor:		
Grade Band	Technical Scope and Progress (40%)		Technical Design Quality (30%)		Justification and Project Relevance (30%)			
Excellent (85 - 100%)	Scope is ambitious, appropriate, and well defined; substantial progress evident; key components, workflow stages, or system elements clearly identified.	40	Excellent technical design; appropriate methods, tools, components, interfaces, and constraints; highly coherent and feasible.	30	Strong justification of design choices; clear relevance to aims, methodology, risks, and next steps.	30		
		38		28		28		
		34		26		26		
Very Good (75 - 84%)	Scope is well defined and appropriate; very good progress evident; most key elements identified clearly.	33	Very good technical design; appropriate and mostly well integrated.	25	Very good justification; relevance, constraints, and dependencies well explained.	25		
		31		24		24		
		30		23		23		
Good (65 - 74%)	Reasonable scope and clear project direction; good progress evident; main elements identified, with some gaps.	29	Good technical design; relevant methods and components identified; some limits in detail or coherence.	22	Good explanation of design choices and project relevance; some justification provided.	22		
		28		21		21		
		26		20		20		
Satisfactory (50 - 64%)	Basic scope identified; limited or uneven progress evident; some important elements missing or underdeveloped.	25	Satisfactory technical design; limited detail; important elements may be missing.	19	Basic justification; limited discussion of relevance, risks, or dependencies.	19		
		23		18		18		
		20		15		15		
Poor (25 - 49%)	Scope is narrow, unclear, or poorly defined; little meaningful progress evident; major elements missing.	19	Weak technical design; flawed, underdeveloped, or poorly matched to project.	15	Poor justification; little insight into relevance, risks, or next steps.	15		
		15		11		11		
		10		8		8		
Very Poor (0 - 24%)	No coherent scope or meaningful progress evident.	8	No meaningful technical design or understanding of methodology.	8	No meaningful justification or project relevance.	8		
		5		4		4		
		0		0		0		
Mark: /100		Comments:						
		Supervisor's Signature:				Date:		