

MRes VEIV Individual Project Mark Sheet 2010

INSTRUCTIONS:

Use the general comments box below to note the particular strengths and weaknesses of the project and any factors that are not covered by the rest of the form. Fill in a % mark for each of the 5 named areas below. Underline key phrases in the descriptions that apply to this project where appropriate (also overleaf). Average 5 marks to get a final % mark. All parts of the form should be filled in. See overleaf for more guidance.

MRes VEIV projects MUST include a thesis statement, background literature review and plan for the EngD project. They may include write-ups of exploratory research work done in the first year. If the project is review heavy, you should use the criteria that relate more to critical depth. If the project includes exploratory work, please include the criteria about depth of contribution.

STUDENT SURNAME:..... STUDENT FORENAME:.....

PROJECT TITLE:.....

1st SUPERVISOR:..... 2nd SUPERVISOR:.....

General Comments:

| WEAKNESSES | STRENGTHS | Mark |
|---|---|------|
| 1. Introduction, Motivation and Aims The student has not clearly stated the aims of the research. The student has failed to motivate the work. The student has failed to identify contributions. vs | The student has clearly understood and stated the aims of the research. Their work is well-motivated and obviously important. There are obvious potential contributions. | |
| 2. Background The student failed to achieve basic aims. Goals weren't sufficiently ambitious to warrant a whole project. Quality of the work is insufficient. The student has not produced sufficient deliverables. vs | The student has achieved all of the stated aims. Project is complex and challenging. The student has produced a considerably body of deliverables in terms of both software and write up. | |
| 3. Clarity The report is unclear or written badly. The write-up is disorganized. Figures and figure legends are of insufficient quality. The presentation is poor. It is hard to understand the core ideas. vs | Report is carefully written. Clear structure with a flowing logical argument. Figures and legends are helpful for understanding the project. It is easy to understand the core ideas. | |
| 4. Contribution For a <i>literature-based report</i> the review is un-critical or un-focused. For a <i>research-based report</i> , the work is poorly designed and is no critical analysis of the results. For both types of report, the work is not novel. vs | For a <i>literature-based report</i> is the review critical and insightful. For a <i>research-based report</i> , there is no critical analysis of the results. For both types of report, the work identifies novel contributions. | |
| 5. Research Plan The project plan is not detailed. The plan is not feasible. vs | The research plan is detailed with obvious outputs. The plan is feasible with key decisions points outlined. | |
| | Your mark (average of above): | |
| | Agreed mark: | |

Marking Guidelines

Degree Classification:

0-49%=Fail, 50-69%=Pass, 70-100%=Distinction

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| 90-100% Perfect | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant contribution to field ••• Evidence of very deep insight in to field and critical review of the field of archival journal quality. Close to faultless in write-up. Very clearly stated, testable hypothesis with detailed schedule to achieve aims. Possibly including significant publishable results. |
| 80-90% Outstanding | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to field ••• Evidence of good critical view of field and original interpretation. Only very minor faults in depth of understanding or write-up. Clearly stated hypothesis with good schedule to achieve aims. Possibly including publishable results. |
| 70-80% Excellent | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very well written report with logical structure ••• Demonstration of critical thought and understanding. Some minor faults in execution or understanding. Clearly stated hypothesis with schedule for initial work. Possibly including substantial deliverables from individual work that should lead to publishable material |
| 60-70% Good | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear project-write up with logical structure ••• Evidence of understanding, and ability to critique literature. May contain some ambiguities or faults. Hypothesis correctly phrased, but testability not completely clear. Possibly including some independent work that can be developed in to publishable material. |
| 50-60% Satisfactory | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate project write-up, lacking clarity or detail in places, or containing irrelevant material ••• Mostly demonstrates understanding of area but with occasional mistakes of judgment. Hypothesis not particularly clear and schedule for early work not year fully clear. Possibly including some early independent work of a preliminary nature. |
| 40-50% Weak | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write up is somewhat incoherent, rushed, contains important omissions, or irrelevant material ••• Some serious flaws in understanding of the field. Proposed contribution not valid nor testable. Very little evidence of original thought. |
| 30-40% Inadequate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topic has not been handled at all well ••• Write up is poor, unstructured, some parts missing. Little evidence of understanding, many inconsistencies and flaws |
| 20-30% Poor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All aspects of the project have been handled badly ••• Write up is substantially absent, incomprehensible or wrong. Little evidence of understanding, but at least mention of most of the relevant ideas. |
| 10-20% Very Poor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost total failure to engage with project ••• Write up substantially absent, incomprehensible or wrong. No concrete hypothesis. Many relevant facts entirely missing |
| 0-10% Derisory | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of any understanding ••• Mention of some relevant terms. Marks given for presentation of report. Complete ignorance of the field. |