

COMP90044 Marking Scheme, Assignment 1

This assignment is marked out of 40 marks

Criteria	Poor	Needs improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Quality of synthesis [10 marks]	The review summarizes individual articles but does not make links between them	The review begins to link together articles but with limited connection to the research question	The review draws together articles in the context of the research question	The review outlines the current state of the field in relation to the research question, making reference to evidence from the literature.	The review presents a compelling overview of the research field, combining and interweaving evidence from the literature to support its claims.
Quality of analysis [10 marks]	The review summarizes contributions from the literature and presents only superficial analysis	The review analyses contributions from the literature independently, without substantial reference to the research question	The review begins to identify strengths and weaknesses of individual articles in the context of the research question	The review effectively identifies the strengths and weaknesses of articles and combines them to identify a research gap	The review presents an outstanding analysis of the current state of the field, drawing on the strengths and weaknesses of existing articles to motivate a clear research gap
Quality of argument [5 marks]	The review presents no clear argument	Many of the review's claims are presented without evidence or justification, drawing only on personal opinion.	The review makes some clear use of evidence from the literature, but it lacks comprehensiveness or depth; some presence of opinion, but it is not dominant	Evidence is used for all key points, and the comparison addresses the major details factually. Some evidence of nuance, opinion is signposted and explained.	Evidence used consistently throughout with a consistent use of scientific principle or good practice. A factual approach is used for both major and minor details, and in general what is important is stated explicitly. Nuance in some of the

					conclusion, and this and opinion are justified with reference to the expectations of the field being examined.
Literature selection [5 marks]	The review includes a manifestly inadequate number of peer-reviewed references	The review falls short of the required number of peer-reviewed references and/or has substantial issues with the referencing style	The review includes a few poorly chosen references and/or has minor issues adopting a valid, consistent referencing style	The review features the required number of peer-reviewed references, correctly and consistently cited.	The review features the required number of peer-reviewed references, correctly and consistently cited and well chosen to motivate discussion on the topic.
Quality of writing [5 marks]	The review contained major spelling/grammar issues that made it difficult to follow	The review contained substantial spelling/grammar issues but still communicated the major points	The review contained minor spelling/grammar issues that didn't impede communication	The review was well written and contained few or no spelling/grammar errors	The review was exceptionally well written and could be published without modification.
Structure & Audience [5 marks]	The review was excessively short or long, rambling, incoherent or purely impressionistic with little or no detail.	The review was somewhat short or long, lacked a clear structure or was targeted towards substantially the wrong audience.	The review was about the required length and structured in a way that could be understood. The audience was generally understood, may have contained some technical concepts not clearly explained.	The review meets the required word count and was clearly structured. Technical concepts were explained in a way that could be understood by a non-expert audience.	The review meets the required word count and was clearly structured to enhance the argument and position the research question. Technical concepts were clearly explained in a way that could be readily understood.