Detailed optional marking scheme for Directed Research (GEG4019 / ENV4000)

Note that the scheme outlined below is optional and may not suit all directed research projects

Research proposal: Click here to enter text / 5 points

Comments: __________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________

(4-5) Excellent. Literature review has covered the necessary subjects in sufficient detail to motivate the research, key terms and concepts are clearly explained, and proposed work has been outlined clearly.

(2-3) Acceptable. Some deficiencies in literature review – terms and concepts not clearly explained, coverage too broad or too narrow, or missing critical elements. Description of proposed work has necessary components, but lacks specificity.

(0-1) Poor. Critical deficiencies in proposal, requiring it to be improved before research can begin.

Progress report: Click here to enter text / 5 points

Comments: __________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________

(4-5) Excellent. Research is progressing well, progress to date has been described in detail, and important challenges for the remaining research have been identified along with strategies to overcome them (if relevant).

(2-3) Acceptable. Research progressing but with avoidable delays, description of progress and remaining challenges exists but lacks clarity and specificity or has omitted critical elements.

(0-1) Poor. Unacceptably slow progress with research, unclear reporting of progress and of remaining challenges, no clear plan to how to complete the research project on time.
Draft paper: Click here to enter text. /40 points

Comments: __________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________

Report structure (out of 10 points)

(8-10) Excellent. Systematic. Use of sub-headings is appropriate and effective. Writing flows well. Ideas and description of information develop logically. Meanings are clear. Sentence structure is concise, grammatical and cohesive. Minimum use of extraneous or repetitious material. No spelling errors. References cited correctly.

(5-7) Acceptable. Evidence of some system, but this could be improved. Meanings are generally clear. Sentence structure grammatical but occasionally incoherent or rambling. Some repetition and some extraneous material. Some spelling errors. References sometimes incomplete or inconsistent.

(0-4) Poor. Lacks systematic arrangement. Subheadings too few for clarity or inappropriately used. Meanings often not clear. Sentence structure not grammatically correct. Much extraneous material. Considerable repetition. Many spelling errors. References frequently cited incorrectly.

Literature Review (out of 5 points)

(4-5) Excellent. Literature review has covered the necessary subjects in sufficient detail to motivate the research, key terms and concepts are clearly explained.

(2-3) Acceptable. Some deficiencies in literature review – terms and concepts not clearly explained, coverage too broad or too narrow, or missing critical elements.

(0-1) Poor. Critical deficiencies in coverage of literature and/or important terms and concepts misunderstood.

Presentation, Interpretation and Analysis of Collected Information (out of 25 points)

(16-20) Excellent. References, figures and tables are easy for the reader to find and follow; legends for figures and tables provide sufficient information. Effective use of tables and graphs. Careful and logical interpretation. Concise and direct. Effective discussion of principles, relationships and significance of results. Interpreted in light of published work. Conclusions stated clearly.

(11-15) Acceptable. Sometimes difficult to find the references, figures, tables etc. referred to in the text. Tables and graphs not always used effectively. Legends provide insufficient information making comprehension of the presented information difficult. Ideas and description of information are somewhat systematic. Relatively careful interpretation. Tends to be a recapitulation of results with little or no interpretation in light of previously published work. Conclusions somewhat unclear.

(0-10) Poor. Difficult to find the references, figures, tables, etc., referred to in the text. Tables and graphics used inappropriately. Ideas and presentation of information are not developed systematically. True meaning of evidence obscured by over-interpretation, or illogical interpretation. Lack of discussion - information limited to recapitulation of results. Absence of concluding statements.
Final paper: Click here to enter text. /40 points

Comments: ____________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Report structure (out of 10 points)

(8-10) Excellent. Systematic. Use of sub-headings is appropriate and effective. Writing flows well. Ideas and description of information develop logically. Meanings are clear. Sentence structure is concise, grammatical and cohesive. Minimum use of extraneous or repetitious material. No spelling errors. References cited correctly.

(5-7) Acceptable. Evidence of some system, but this could be improved. Meanings are generally clear. Sentence structure grammatical but occasionally incoherent or rambling. Some repetition and some extraneous material. Some spelling errors. References sometimes incomplete or inconsistent.

(0-4) Poor. Lacks systematic arrangement. Subheadings too few for clarity or inappropriately used. Meanings often not clear. Sentence structure not grammatically correct. Much extraneous material. Considerable repetition. Many spelling errors. References frequently cited incorrectly.

Literature Review (out of 5 points)

(4-5) Excellent. Literature review has covered the necessary subjects in sufficient detail to motivate the research, key terms and concepts are clearly explained.

(2-3) Acceptable. Some deficiencies in literature review – terms and concepts not clearly explained, coverage too broad or too narrow, or missing critical elements.

(0-1) Poor. Critical deficiencies in coverage of literature and/or important terms and concepts misunderstood.

Presentation, Interpretation and Analysis of Collected Information (out of 25 points)

(16-20) Excellent. References, figures and tables are easy for the reader to find and follow; legends for figures and tables provide sufficient information. Effective use of tables and graphs. Careful and logical interpretation. Concise and direct. Effective discussion of principles, relationships and significance of results. Interpreted in light of published work. Conclusions stated clearly.

(11-15) Acceptable. Sometimes difficult to find the references, figures, tables etc. referred to in the text. Tables and graphs not always used effectively. Legends provide insufficient information making comprehension of the presented information difficult. Ideas and description of information are somewhat systematic. Relatively careful interpretation. Tends to be a recapitulation of results with little or no interpretation in light of previously published work. Conclusions somewhat unclear.

(0-10) Poor. Difficult to find the references, figures, tables, etc., referred to in the text. Tables and graphics used inappropriately. Ideas and presentation of information are not developed systematically. True meaning of evidence obscured by over-interpretation, or illogical interpretation. Lack of discussion - information limited to recapitulation of results. Absence of concluding statements.
Poster presentation: Click here to enter text. /10 points

Comments: __________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________

Poster (out of 5 points)

(4-5) Excellent. Easy to interpret on its own. Use of graphs and figures is appropriate and effective. Structure flows well. Writing is concise, grammatical and cohesive. Minimum use of extraneous or repetitious material. No spelling errors. References cited correctly.

(2-3) Acceptable. Mostly interpretable on its own, but some information missing (e.g. definition of terms, units, or context necessary for understanding). Meanings are generally clear. Sentence structure grammatical but occasionally incoherent. Some repetition and some extraneous material. Some spelling errors. References sometimes incomplete or inconsistent.


Presentation (out of 5 points)

(4-5) Excellent. Purpose of research project clearly identified. Methods and information used to answer research question clearly outlined. Results described in detail, and discussion of results in the context of the project insightful. Conclusions clearly explained on the basis of results.

(2-3) Acceptable. Purpose of research project identified, but link between research question and methods/information unclear. Results described in some detail. Discussion of results lacking in depth and/or breadth. Conclusions explained with some basis in results.

(0-1) Poor. Purpose of research project not clearly identified. Link between research question and methods/information lacking or unclear. Results unclear or vague. Discussion of results incoherent, unrelated to research question, or only weakly based on results. Conclusions absent, or insufficiently based on results.