CASA dissertation mark scheme for modules CASA0004, CASA0010 and CASA0012

This mark scheme is composed of two parts, the first of which is applicable to all students and **the second only those** on the MRes spatial data science and visualisation (dissertation module CASA0004) who are required to submit a dissertation thesis **and** a publication document.

Part 1: applicable to all students

Criterion	80-100% (A*)	70-79% (A)	60-69% (B)	50-59% (C)	40-49% (D)	1-39% (E)
Review and research framing	Extensive and systematic background research evaluating a multitude of credible sources (e.g. academic and policy) using an in-depth and thorough narrative that seamlessly leads the reader to an innovative globally pertinent or topical research question. There is unambiguous attribution of ideas and no inaccuracies.	A broad range of background research evaluating a multitude of credible sources (e.g. academic and policy) using an extensive narrative to produce a convincing framing of a highly pertinent or topical research question. There is clear attribution of ideas with few inaccuracies.	A range of background research evaluating multiple forms of credible sources (e.g. academic and policy) with an adequately developed narrative to produce a legitimate farming of the pertinent or topical research question. Attribution of ideas is mostly clear with some minor inaccuracies.	Background research considering several credible sources to produce a plausible framing of the somewhat pertinent or topical research question with a fairly adequate narrative. A more appropriate variation of the research question could have been proposed. Attribution of ideas is basic and irregular with some inaccuracies.	Limited background research considering few credible sources, producing an implausible framing of a vaguely pertinent or topical research question with no narrative. The research question should be reconsidered. Attribution of ideas is insufficient with major inaccuracies.	No evidence of relevant background research, with an illogical and irrelevant and/or untopical research question. The section requires a full re-write. There is no attribution of ideas.
Research design	An innovative, expertly explained and fully, easily reproducible research design that is based on an exceptionally robust choice of data	An original, refined, fully explained and fully reproducible research design that is based on an entirely appropriate choice of data and methods. It	A robust, well explained and mostly reproducible research design that is based on a well justified choice of data and methods. It demonstrates	A sound and adequately documented, broadly reproducible research design that is based on a plausible choice of data and methods. It	An unclear and insufficiently documented research design that is based on an ill-justified choice of data and methods. . There is very limited	An incomplete or highly deficient research design marked by an unjustified or inappropriate choice of data and methods.

	and methods. It demonstrates creativity, a comprehensive understanding of appropriate sophisticated techniques, exemplary technical proficiency and skills and extensive, critical ethical reflection.	demonstrates excellent understanding of appropriate techniques, technical proficiency and skills and critical ethical reflection.	competent understanding of analytical techniques, sound technical ability and ethical reflection.	demonstrates sound understanding of techniques taught in the programme, basic technical knowledge and some ethical awareness.	evidence of knowledge and understanding of techniques taught in the programme alongside scant ethical reflection.	There is no evidence of knowledge and understanding of techniques taught in the programme and no ethical awareness.
Analysis and critical reflection of findings	Interpretations of results are exceptionally well-constructed, clear and focused with a seamless narrative throughout. The discussion provides exemplary critical reflection on the project's outcomes, strengths and limitations with extensive links to current academic and policy (if applicable) debates.	Interpretations of results are very well constructed, clear and focused with a well-developed narrative throughout. The discussion provides appropriate critical reflections on the project's outcomes, strengths and limitations with good links to relevant academic and policy (if applicable) debates.	Interpretations of results are cogent and logically constructed argument with a consistent narrative throughout. Critical reflections on the project's outcomes, strengths and limitations are present within the discussion with some linkage to academic and policy (if applicable) debates.	Interpretations of results are simple and plausibly constructed with an adequate narrative that may lack detail in parts. Awareness of the project's outcomes, strengths and limitations is evident and basic reference is made to academic or policy (if appropriate) debates.	Interpretations of results are illogical, vague and ambiguous, without coherent narrative. Critical reflections are limited and with no or scant reference to academic or policy (if appropriate) debates.	Results have not been interpreted and there is no evidence of any critical reflection.
Visualisation and communication	Visualisations, maps, figures and outputs are entirely appropriate and	Visualisations, maps, figures and outputs are highly capable and refined for the data	Visualisations, maps, figures and outputs are clear and appropriate/effective	Visualisations, maps, figures and outputs are basic and plausible but more appropriate	Visualisations, maps, figures and outputs are poor and do not aid understanding in	Visualisations, maps, figures and outputs are bad or missing entirely. Any present

insightful for the data and analysis, and are of publication quality. Visualisations convey information expertly, demonstrating innovation and excellent design practice. The writing throughout is of exceptional quality, engaging and clear, being of publication quality.	and analysis, and are of high quality. Visualisations effectively convey information and demonstrate excellent design practice. The writing is of very high quality, engaging and clear.	but would benefit from slight improvements (e.g. too much irrelevant detail, or limitations in the visualisation type selected). The writing is of adequate quality and clear.	versions could have been implemented. The writing quality is rather basic and mostly clear.	any way. Maps and visualisations may lack even basic features such as legends, and the design quality is poor. The writing is haphazard in places, has poor structure and lacks clarity.	maps and visualisations may be full of major problems, irrelevant and produce confusion for the reader. The writing is very illogical, difficult to understand and lacks any structure.

Distribution of marks for part 1, applicable to all students

This section outlines the percentage weighting of each criterion in the marking scheme. This is **slightly different <u>dependent on the programme you are enrolled</u>** on so please read carefully.

Criterion	Smart Cities and Urban Analytics (%)	Spatial Data Science and Visualisation (%)
Review and research framing	30	25
Research design	30	25
Analysis and critical reflection of findings	30	25
Visualisation and communication	10	25

Please note, poor academic practice or academic misconduct will be reported to the Module Convenor in the first instance who will follow the relevant policies outlined in the UCL academic manual, Chapter 6, section 9. This is applicable to both Part 1 and Part 2.

Part 2: applicable to only those on the MRes spatial data science and visualisation (dissertation module CASA0004)

Criterion	80-100% (A+)	70-79% (A)	60-69% (B)	50-59% (C)	40-49% (D)	1-39% (E)
Publication framing, structure and synthesis	The thesis has been expertly synthesised and structured into an original and distinct publication that would be accepted by a relevant journal with no corrections. The title, abstract and conclusions brilliantly summarise the research contribution and findings. The research is excellently situated within the existing literature. All figures/tables are of very high quality.	The thesis has been synthesised and condensed very well into an original and distinct publication that would be accepted by a relevant journal with minor corrections. These could include amendments to figures, some additional explanation of certain concepts and inclusion of broader literature. The title, abstract and conclusions skilfully summarise the research contribution and findings. Figures/tables are of high quality.	The majority of the thesis has been structured and condensed well, but would need refinement for published material and would likely receive major corrections from a journal. These could include some lengthy and non-synthesised explanations and a few vague or ambiguous statements. The title, abstract and conclusions summarise the research findings, but could be improved in terms of defining the original contribution and framing the research. Figures and/or tables are of a good quality but would benefit from minor improvements.	There is some evidence of synthesis and condensation of the thesis throughout all sections in the publication document, but this could have been more selective. It is likely that the publication would be invited for resubmission. The title, abstract and conclusions attempt to frame the research and defining the original contribution. Figures and/or tables are adequate and basic but not of journal publication quality.	An attempt has been made at synthesising limited sections of the thesis into a publication document. However, the publication has very significant flaws as a journal article. The structure is poor, and the title, abstract and conclusions fail to summarise the research and to define any original research contribution. The publication fails to place the research in the context of existing literature. Figures/tables are of poor quality.	No attempt has been made to synthesise and structure the thesis into a journal article. The publication is copied from the thesis and no attempt has been made at appropriate framing of the research and defining an original contribution. Title, abstract and conclusions are highly flawed. Figures and tables are missing or of very poor quality.

Distribution of marks for part 2, applicable to only those on the MRes spatial data science and visualisation (dissertation module CASA0004).

This section outlines the percentage weighting of each criterion in the marking scheme

- Publication framing, structure and synthesis: 100%

Part 2 (the publication document) forms 30% of your final module grade with the other 70% coming from the dissertation thesis.