COMP1205 Techical Report Marking Scheme

Total: 100 marks

Report Content	A 1st	B 2.1	C 2.2	D 3rd	Fail
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 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 from reading the title of the report. Maybe much too long or much too short.
10%	7 to 10	6 to 7	5 to 6	3 to 5	0-3
Quality of introduction: tells me what the question is, what is the state of the art is in the area and should reference current peer reviewed literature.	Good Introduction, covers questions raised in the set topic Interesting or thorough 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%	10.5-15	9-10.5	7.5-9	6-7.5	0-6
Quality and clarity of argument /enjoyability Narrative/story that ties the report together making even complex topics easier to understand.	Discussion shows clear depth of analysis, clarity of argument 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 limited discussion or additional 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%	7 to 10	6 to 7	5 to 6	3 to 5	0-3
Quality of overall analysis and conclusions Summarizes analyzes what has been learned in order to synthesize and address answers to the questions asked in the introduction. Discuss limitations of report /possibly suggesting further work.	Conclusion shows excellent 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 of 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. Does not exist or relate to text
15%	10.5-15	9-10.5	7.5-9	6-7.5	0-6

	A 1st	B 2.1	C 2.2	D 3rd	Fail
Quality of cited literature Ideally peer-reviewed, appropriately up-to-date. Footnotes for refs. to material which might change e.g. websites. Reference list for all other references.	Wide range of recent sources of literature listed using literature 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. websites).	Limited referencing. The few that are there are simply websites and secondary sources.
10% 7 to 10		6 to 7	5 to 6	3 to 5	0-3
Structure and appearance of report What the report looks like conforms to specifications	Excellent appearance. Strong structure of main sections, well laid out. Clear structured and logical. Good/relevant diagrams/illustrations.	Well presented. Clear layout, some diagrams, adequately annotated. Addresses topic in a logical/structured manner	Acceptable appearance. Main sections have some structure. Could do better diagrams. May not have used template properly.	Appears disorganized. Lacks Overall structure. Either lacks diagrams or they are misleading/ poorly labeled/eye candy diagrams.	Poorly presented. No obvious structure, difficult to work out what is where. Failed to use template. Diagrams 'eye candy' rather than explanatory.
10% 7 to 10		6 to 7	5 to 6	3 to 5	0-3
Readability how easy is it to read and understand this report	Meaning clear and fluent, originality in expression, logical progression and very high quality grammar and expression.	Meaning clear and logical Good quality writing making appropriate use of grammar and expression.	Meaning and text quite clear, Some faults in use of grammar and expression.	Meaning and text fairly not always clea/does not always make the point, Occasional poor use of grammar/voice.	Difficult to read: perhaps because it lacked logical progression OR the use of grammar and expression was very poor.
10% 7 to 10		6 to 7	5 to 6	3 to 5	0-3
References: Correct using of citations, references and reference list Adheres to Harvard convention (Name, Date)	Correct use of citations, references are complete including names of all authors, full provenance of sources, and dated on-line alternatives if appropriate, correct convention	There are a few references that are incomplete or missing information– but references/citations are generally good and complete	Quite a number of errors in the citations and referencing. Some would be difficult to locate based on this information.	Citations flawed - some references incomplete so 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% 7 to 10		6 to 7	5 to 6	3 to 5	0-3
Quality of academic integrity/originality	The work has a Turnitin score in single figures or zero usually due to false positives	n/a	n/a	A low double figure Turnitin score revealing sloppiness, excessive quotation or paraphrasing leaving little work of originality.	Higher double figure Turnitin score revealing sources of copied content either piecemeal or in a patchwork manner or no AI declaration
10% 7 to 10		6 to 7	5 to 6	3 to 5	0-3