# Rapid review to use with report draft

This framework can be used at any stage from storyboarding through to late draft in one of the following ways

* Planning – before you start or when your ideas are well formed, estimate your competency/confidence
* For a quick self-review during the development process – can be used itteratively
* As the basis for discussion during a content oriented peer review session, from early to late draft

Work through each criteria in turn, and score the factor on a 1-4 range, then provide a brief comment

1: Needs Improvement; 2 Satisfactory; 3 Very Satisfactory; 4 Outstanding

The top level descriptors here are generic

This review refers to generic sections with some customisation to the the report specification in WEBS6203

You are advisedto look at the criteria in detail:

However before you begin any review you need to decide for yourself the purpose of the review, and the sort of outcomes you would like:

These could include trying to think systematically about some aspect of the report – these are itmes which are good for either self or peer review.

* How much work do I need to do in order to get my draft to a good enough state that I could hand it in?
* My sense is that <some aspect of the report> needs more work – can I work out systemematically, with help from the assessement criteria what I need to do?
* I had difficulty explaining <an idea, some aspect or the argument etc> what could I change/how could I do or say things differently>?
* I think the report is uneven, how can I improve it?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria descriptor | NI 1 | S 2 | VS 3 | O 4 | **Comments** |
| Title |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abstract Short and concise can be read in its own right. Follows the standard four part structure |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Keywords** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Introduction**  Sets the context for the study |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Background**  Introduces the ideas of web science and common ground |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Method**  In this case the outcomes of the research and thinking which you did – explaining your two disciplines |  |  |  |  |  |
| Discussion Comparing the two disciplines, discussing them in terms of Repko Common Ground or other interdisciplinary theories and concepts along with Web Science Research – may refer back to the literature in the background |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Conclusions**  Logically draws together the arguments |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Future work**  Lays out the way in which your topic could be investigated in the future, particularly looking at data for evidence from a web science perspective |  |  |  |  |  |
| References The literature which you cited – correctly |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Bibliography** Lists any additional uncited literature or reading which influenced your thinking and the report content |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Appendices**  Additional materials - will not appear in this report assignemnt |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Report structure**  Have you included all possible sections of the report including a table of contents, list of figures and tables |  |  |  |  |  |

## Any additional observations: