|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Technical Report Marking Scheme | | | | | | |
|  | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **F** | **ACTUAL MARK** |
| **Quality of the Abstract**  The abstract should tell me why I need to read this, what I will learn and tell me the important conclusion It must be stand-alone. | Well-written Abstract. After reading this I am quite clear why I need to read the report, what I am going to find out in the report and what the important conclusion will be.  No citations in the abstract. | Good Abstract. After reading this I am mostly clear why I need to read the report, what I am going to find out in the report and what the important conclusion will be.  No citations in the abstract. | Fair abstract, although after reading it I am not fully clear why I need to read the report, what I am going to find out in the report and what the important conclusion will be.  The abstract is not stand-alone (e.g has citations). | An attempt at an Abstract: Fails to make it clear why I need to read the report, what I am going to find out in the report and what the important conclusion will be. May not be stand-alone – maybe too long or too short. | After reading this I am little the wiser than I was from reading the title of the report. Maybe much too long or much too short. | **10%** |
| **Quality of Introduction**:  Introduction should tell me what the question is, what is the state of the art is in the area and should reference current literature. | Good Introduction, covering the questions raised in the project topic. Interesting and comprehensive background and state of the art, demonstrating background reading/ research. | Appropriate introduction, with fair explanation of questions the report will answer. Good coverage of state of the art and background information on the topic. | Adequate introduction, although not quite clear what question report will answer. Adequate coverage of background information. | Some attempt at an introduction; background information and rationale for the topic of the project, but not to an appropriate level. | Inadequate introduction, little if any evidence of background reading. | 15% |
| **Quality and Clarity of Argument (enjoyability)**  Should have a good narrative (story) that ties the report together making even complex topics easier to understand. | Discussion of topic covered in a way which shows depth of analysis, exploration and synthesis of information, not superficial reporting of facts. | Good narrative and discussion with some analysis and synthesis. | Discussion demonstrates  basic understanding, but limited to a factual account  only, with little discussion or analysis. | Superficial reporting, no demonstration of in-depth understanding of topic. | Lack of evidence that student has understood  the information, with a tendency to regurgitate facts. Poor discussion. | 10% |
| **Quality of Overall Analysis and Conclusions**  A conclusion should summarize and analyze what has been learned in order to synthesize and address answers to the questions asked in the introduction. Should also discuss any limitations to the report and possibly suggest further work. | Conclusion shows good integrations of introduction and discussions, introduces issues for further exploration. Shows awareness of limitations of report. | Relevant issues and problems identified and discussed with some analysis good summary or lessons learned. Good conclusion demonstrating curiosity. Possibly over confident in answer. | Some relevant issues are identified and discussed, shows comprehension, no significant errors or omissions, some conclusions drawn. Conclusion does not raise issues for further exploration | Superficial relevance and limited comprehension, error in judgments and misleading summary. Weak conclusion. | No more than a summary of what has already been said. | 15% |
| **Quality of Cited Literature**  The best literature comes from peer-reviewed sources and should be appropriately up-to-date. Should not include references to material which might change – these websites should be footnotes. | Wide range of recent  sources of literature listed using primary literature and mostly from credible peer reviewed sources. | Good range of recent literature and sources – the majority from peer reviewed and primary sources | Fair number of references although they are mostly not primary sources or peer reviewed | Few sources referenced, only basic texts on a restricted range of subjects. Many are not from peer reviewed sources. (e.g they are websites). | Limited referencing. The few that are there are simply websites and secondary sources. | 10% |
| **Correct using of Citations/References/**  **Bibliography** | Correct use of citations, and the references are complete including names of all authors, full provenance of the sources, and dated on-line alternatives where appropriate | There are a few references that are incomplete – but references/citations are generally good and complete | Quite a number of errors in the citation and referencing. Some would be difficult to locate based on this information. | Some of the references are incomplete to the extent that it would not be possible to use this information to find them, so their provenance is not clear. | The referencing is mess and it would not be possible to tell the provenance or find the information | 10% |
| **Structure and appearance of report**  (what the report looks like) | Excellent clear presentation.  Strong structure of main sections, well laid out. Clear structured and logical. Good diagrams/illustrations. | Good presentation. Clear layout, some diagrams, adequately annotated. Overall addresses topic in a logical and structured manner | Acceptable presentation. Main sections have fair structure. Could do better diagrams. Not used template properly. | Disorganized presentation. Unsatisfactory structure. Poor labeling of, or no diagrams. Overall lacks structure. | Poor presentation. No obvious structure, difficult to work out what is where. Failed to use template. | **10%** |
| **Readability**  (how easy is it to read and understand this report) | Meaning clear and fluent, originality in expression, logical progression and perfect English. | Meaning clear and logical. Good English. | Meaning and text quite clear. Some faults in English | Meaning and text fairly not always clear and does not always make the point. Poor English in some places. | It was difficult to read this – perhaps because it was lacking in logical progression or the English was seriously bad. | **10%** |
| **Originality** | No Plagiarism (probably less than 5% in Turnitin, and the things marked are just coincidences | n/a | n/a | There are places where citation has not been done properly – although it is clear that the source is cited. | There are some comments that have clearly been copied from other sources and not cited.  -OR-  Originality declaration omitted. | 10% |

(An A would be 9/10; a B would be 7/10; a C would be 5/10; a D would be 3/10; an F would be 1/10. Or if out of 15 multiply by 1.5!)