

Report Marking Guide for Cyber-Physical Systems Seminar Course

Criterion	Ranging from						to
Abstract	None/ uninformative	5	4	3	2	1	Publishable
Background	Scant, trivial, irrelevant	5	4	3	2	1	Comprehensive, relevant, showing understanding
Literature/State-of-the-Art	Not up-to-date, unresearched	5	4	3	2	1	Up to date, relevant
Description of original work and methodology	Inadequate/ incomprehensible	5	4	3	2	1	Perfectly clear
Scientific/engineering content	Inaccurate, unscientific, full of mistakes	5	4	3	2	1	Appropriate, in-depth, showing understanding
Evidence of originality (where applicable)	Negligible	5	4	3	2	1	Clear innovation
Discussion	Very shallow	5	4	3	2	1	Multifaceted, publishable
Conclusions	None/trivial/ misleading	5	4	3	2	1	Clear, concise, accurate
Suggestions for further work	None	5	4	3	2	1	Pertinent, shows understanding of topic
References	Hardly any, irrelevant	5	4	3	2	1	Relevant, sufficient number, fully detailed
Findings placed in context: awareness of implications for research, business, sustainability or society	None, or narrow and blinkered	5	4	3	2	1	Well thought-out, multifaceted, critical
Visuals and tables	Scruffy, poorly laid out, unlabelled, scarcely used	5	4	3	2	1	Labelled and referenced in text, well laid-out, well chosen
Quantity of work done	Two weeks' worth	5	4	3	2	1	Two months
English/German prose and spelling	Difficult/ impossible to follow	5	4	3	2	1	Correct, clear and concise
Overall Structure	Disorganised, rambling	5	4	3	2	1	Easy to follow
Overall presentation	Messy, poorly formatted	5	4	3	2	1	Professional-looking

STUDENT NAME:
EVALUATOR:
RECOMMENDED GRADE: