

Requirements and marking criteria for EMI Capstone Final Report.

Introduction:

The project final report is the major report on your project. The final report will detail the problem investigated and why it is important, a concise review of the literature around the problem, a concise description of the methodology and methods used, a presentation of the results and analysis, a discussion of the results and their limitations and a conclusion with future recommendations of the report.

The following table gives a detailed view of how the report will be assessed. The criteria briefly indicates what the assessors are looking for in the report, while examples of the varying levels of meeting the criteria are given. The assessors will be taking a holistic view to grading each aspect into the eight categories, and the descriptors should be taken as a guide rather than a definitive list of what is required for each category. The weighting of each aspect is as indicated.

| Aspect | Criteria | Absent (0%) | Inadequate (30%) | Fair (55 %) | Moderate (65%) | Good (75%) | Excellent (85%) | Outstanding (100%) |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Overall Research Quality (20%) | As an academic reviewing this report for an external client and or a conference/journal, how would you rate the quality of the research conducted and presented. | Unacceptable – return to authors for total revision. | Unacceptable – return to authors for major revision. | Almost acceptable – but return to authors for major revision before sending to client. | Acceptable – but return to authors for moderate revision before sending to client. Not conference quality | Acceptable – but return to authors for minor revision before sending to client. Conference quality with some revisions | Acceptable – but return to authors for very minor revision before sending to client. Journal quality with some revisions | Acceptable – send to the client without revision. Journal quality |
| Production, language and structure (10%) | A template for the report is available on the LMS. It is expected that all aspects of this template be followed. The text is clearly readable, grammatically correct, concise, without spelling errors. The report should have an executive summary, introduction, literature review, methods, results and analysis, discussion, conclusion and references sections. | Completely ignored template or almost unreadable. Report is completely lacking formal structure, or several of the components missing. | Minimal attention paid to template. Major departures from style or only just readable with many English errors. A structural component missing or included in a cursory manner. | Most aspects followed but still significant departures from the style required. Examples include poor production of figures, inconsistent citations and reference lists, missing or misplaced captions. Lack of uniformity of fonts and paragraph styles. Meaning of document is clear despite poor English. | Most aspects followed but some significant departures from the style required. Examples include poor production of figures, inconsistent citations and reference lists, missing or misplaced captions. Lack of uniformity of fonts and paragraph styles. Meaning of document is clear despite poor English. | Most aspects of template followed. Few grammatical and spelling errors. Clear structure, but some components or paragraphs in wrong sections, or the narrative is not always clear. | Followed template to a high degree and is easily readable with very few English errors. Clear structure and material contained in various sections appropriate to that section and a clear narrative. | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | Attempted to follow structure, but reader has difficulty understanding the report. | Attempted to follow structure, but a clear thread not developed to help the reader understand the report. | | | |
| Academic Integrity (5%) | Where appropriate the words, graphics and ideas in the report are attributed to the original authors. Citations and references are technically correct. | Clear plagiarism – this will result in the report being referred to student disciplinary committee for determination and report will not be graded until outcome known. | Citations missing, gross disparity between citations and reference list. Students may be referred to disciplinary committee and report will not be graded until outcome known. | Missing citations and bibliographic details that don't allow the original source to be located. | Some missing citations and bibliographic details that don't allow the original source to be located. Sometimes distinction in the writing style as to the ownership of words and ideas is not clear. | Minor technical issues with referencing. Clear distinction in the writing style as to the ownership of words and ideas. | Report written within the spirit and requirements of academic integrity. | |
| Literature review (10%) | The literature review clearly supports the investigation of the issue and is the primary basis for the research to be undertaken. | Literature review is absent. | Characteristics include poor quality references, failure to seek corroborating evidence, an argument is not developed in the review usually because it is a summary of the literature, and/or no conclusions drawn to support the research direction. | Sources cited are of poor quality and do not support the argument being put. There is probably no significant conclusion drawn from the literature to direct the research or its methodology. | A range of high quality sources used, but the scope is not sufficient to fully inform the research, or review is a summary rather than a critical review. | A range of high quality sources used to support arguments, but the scope is not sufficient to fully inform the research. | Critical review of a range of high quality sources used to support arguments and scope is sufficient to fully inform the research. Includes literature on both the issue and methodology. | |
| Methodology and method (10%) | The methodology and method describes how the issue was investigated and includes a brief description of resources required to undertake the research. | Most of the aspects absent. | A cursory attempt is made at describing a method of investigation and little or no attention paid as to the resources required. | A good description of the method or methodology, but not both. A brief discussion of resource requirements. | A discussion of methodology and method, but sometimes unclear as to how the methods produced the results. | A sound discussion of methodology, but some methods not clearly explained. | Methodology, methods and resources clearly explained and linked to how they will achieve the project outcomes. | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Results and Analysis (20%) | The evidence arising from the investigation is clearly shown using easily understandable tables and graphics. The evidence is interpreted using analytical techniques appropriate for the data. | Results and analysis are absent. | Little evidence arising from research is provided or is presented in an incoherent manner. Analysis is simplistic in the context of the student's knowledge base. | Evidence is presented, but analysis is not particularly probing or enlightening about the underlying information in the data. | Evidence is presented that emerges from the method, analysis may not be convincing, new insights into the evidence are not strong. | Evidence is presented that clearly emerges from the method and is analyzed in such a manner that new insights into the evidence are apparent. | Multiple strands of evidence are presented from the analysis undertaken that provide a strong grounding for subsequent discussion. | |
| Discussion (20%) | The outcomes of the analysis are discussed in the context of the literature and limitations identified. | Discussion is absent. | Poor connection between the results obtained and the issue being investigated. Few limitations presented. | Some discussion based on analysis, but flaws of logic and little reference back to literature. Some obvious limitations presented. | Sound discussion, but with some flaws in the argument, minor links to previous literature. Some insightful limitations presented. | Sound discussion, but with some minor flaws in the argument, linked to literature. Insightful limitations presented. | Strong and well-argued discussion that builds on the knowledge of the literature. Very insightful limitations identified. | |
| Conclusion & Recommendations (5%) | Clear conclusions are drawn about the research findings and are linked to the objectives. Clear recommendations for future work or presented. | Conclusion and recommendations is absent. | Conclusions not related to issue and not based on body of report. Recommendations are poor. | Conclusions presented, but relate poorly to issue and objectives. May introduce new material or arguments not previously canvassed. Limited recommendations. | Conclusions that relate to the issue, but may not clearly depend on the results, analysis and discussion. Some obvious recommendations made. | Sound conclusions that relate to the issue, but do not fully capitalize on the results, analysis and discussion. Sound recommendations presented. | Strong conclusions drawn that clearly link the issue, objectives, analysis and discussion. Excellent recommendations presented. | |