

## ELEC6211 Project Preparation General Research Review Outline Marking Scheme

### Assessment Descriptors

Marks are assigned to each of the major elements of this module according to the following weightings and descriptors. Note that these are rather general, and in some cases may not apply, for example where a project has followed an unusual approach, in which case the examiners are free to use different weightings and/or descriptors. The grades here follow the usual scale in which:

F	E	D	C	B	A	A+	A*
0% - 29%	30% - 39%	40% - 49%	50% - 59%	60% - 69%	70% - 79%	80% - 89%	90% - 100%

Grade	Criteria for General Review		
	Writing and Structure (minimum 30%)	Research Context and Analysis (guide 40%)	Technical Context and Motivation (guide 30%)
A*	Extremely well written and structured, no spelling or grammatical errors. Clear and easy to follow narrative describing the general field of research.	Insightful review of related work and references as in a typical research paper. Critical and comparative analysis of previous work.	Excellent and insightful definition of technical aspects of the field and the motivation for work in this area. Clear articulation of opportunities to do research in this field.
A+	Very well written and structured, few spelling or grammatical errors. Clear narrative to the writing.	Thorough review of related work, range of references including refereed work. Excellent comparative analysis and evidence of critical discussion.	Clear definition of technical aspects of the field and the motivation. Opportunities for research in this field are apparent
A	Well written and structured, few spelling or grammatical errors. Good narrative and reasonably easy to follow.	Good review, and range of references to peer reviewed work. Comparative analysis present and some evidence of critical discussion.	Technical aspects of the field defined. Research motivation in this area defined. Research opportunities are partly defined.
B	Well written, few spelling or grammatical errors. Reasonable structure and the narrative.	Adequate review, some references to peer reviewed work. Fair attempt at critical analysis and comparison of work	Technical aspects of the field and the motivation for the project topic are partly defined. Some evidence of research opportunities but needs reworking.
C	Well written, some spelling or grammatical errors. Attempt at a structured narrative.	Adequate background reading, insufficient references. Some evidence of critical analysis of previous work.	Definition of technical aspects of the field and the motivation for the project topic needs reworking. No presentation of opportunities for work in this area.
D	Adequately written report, grammatical and spelling errors. No clear narrative or structure to the review.	Some background reading, but some inappropriate material included. No comparative analysis or comparison of work.	Needs reworking. Technical aspects and motivation not clear. No presentation of opportunities for work in this area.
E	Inadequately written report. No structure. Difficult to follow.	Insufficient or inappropriate background reading. No comparative analysis or comparison of work.	Needs substantial rewriting. No presentation of technical aspects and motivation not clear. No presentation of opportunities for work in this area.
F	Report difficult to understand. Spelling and grammatical errors throughout.	Clearly inadequate background reading. No comparative analysis or comparison of work.	Contains no technical detail or discussion of motivation. No presentation of opportunities for work in this area.