

Marking guidelines for Mini-Projects ¹				
	Coverage (range and understanding of sources; synthesis and focusing of ideas on the topic)	Analysis and where relevant reflection in practice (organisation / coherence of argument; support through example / detail / quotations / references / experience; critical approach)	Presentation (length; use of academic conventions; spelling, grammar, paragraphing, etc; layout; proof-reading)	Where Appropriate: Investigation / Research (questions; rationale; theoretical background; data collection methods, critical analysis; implications)
70% - 100%	Comprehensive coverage of sources; evidence of scholarship in understanding of ideas; originality in synthesis of ideas and focus on the topic.	Shows originality through critical questioning of received ideas; and suggestion of alternative perspectives; meticulous, well-supported analysis; insightful evaluation / conclusion / implications.	Is concise within the requirements of the task; skilled use of academic conventions; skilful layout etc; accurate proof-reading.	Where appropriate: Originality in identification of questions; excellent theoretical background showing critical appreciation of underlying ideas; skilled research design, carefully and critically applied; insightful analysis with critical / innovative interpretation of implications.
60% - 69%	Competent coverage of major sources; shows depth of understanding of the topic; relationships between ideas cogently made.	Critical review and synthesis of ideas; coherent, realistic and well -supported argument; insightful use of own ideas and experience; perceptive appraisal of implications.	Competent control of length; skilled use of academic conventions; clear layout etc; almost all errors eliminated in proof-reading.	Where appropriate: Perceptive presentation of questions; cogent, theoretically-based rationale; good research design with critical analysis of data; careful appraisal of implications.
50% - 59%	Shows acquaintance with and understanding of key concepts and issues from a range of sources; ideas synthesised and related to the topic.	Ideas organised and grouped to present a coherent argument; use of examples / detail / quotations / references / experience to support argument; some critical analysis of ideas / evidence.	Length requirements observed; appropriate use of academic conventions; effective uses of spelling etc; careful proof-reading.	Where appropriate: Clear statement of research questions; rationale provided for research approach taken and some relation to underlying theories made; some critical analysis discussion and presentation of results; appropriate implications drawn from the study.
30% - 49%	Evidence of reading in the field; identification of some pertinent issues; superficiality in treatment of the topic.	Appropriate organisation; some evidence of understanding of ideas and ability to relate ideas and experience; mainly descriptive with limited attempt at critical judgement; occasional inconsistencies.	Length requirements observed; basic command of academic conventions; some errors in proof-reading but largely accurate spelling, etc.	Where appropriate: Research questions given though may not be fully contextualised; limited rationale; some theoretical background attempted; data collection methods relevant; analysis attempted but may lack depth; some implications examined.
0% - 29%	Limited range of ideas; shows weak acquaintance with sources; ideas unfocused.	Disjointed organisation; unsupported arguments; little use of relevant experience; descriptive without critical analysis.	Length requirements not observed; use of unattributed material; incomplete referencing; presentation marred by language errors affecting comprehensibility; inadequate proof-reading.	Where appropriate: Research questions unclear; rationale weak; theoretical background very limited; methods not well chosen or misapplied; analysis sketchy or unjustified by data; implications asserted or untenable.

¹ The guidelines are based on the Marking Grid developed by the LIGTH unit at University of Leeds; adapted with permission.