

Student name:

Project short title:

Examiner's initials:

Mark assigned: _____ (to 2 decimal places)

This form is for marking Honours/MSci(WP) project reports. Each of the four sections (“style and presentation”, “approach”, “quality of description” and “conclusion/interpretation”) should be given an individual mark between 0 and 22 based on the headings (Poor, Weak etc..) and the heading descriptors. To help the marker decide on a mark for each section, some examples of characteristics to be assessed in that section are listed. The final report mark is the sum of the individual section marks multiplied by their associated weights; this is the grade point average. There are two examiners: the project supervisor and one other. The examiners mark projects independently and their marks are averaged. If there is a discrepancy of 3 marks or more (in the grade point average) the two examiners will discuss the project and in the case of any disputes a third examiner will assess the project. A final report mark will then be agreed on. The examiner should provide general comments, touching upon each of the four criteria below, on page 2. The final report mark is then combined with the mark from the project talk as described in the Project guidelines. **Please return the form electronically to Kathleen Mosson (Kathleen.mosson@glasgow.ac.uk).**

<i>Criterion</i>	<i>Poor</i> <i>0-5</i>	<i>Weak</i> <i>6-8</i>	<i>Acceptable</i> <i>9-11</i>	<i>Moderate</i> <i>12-14</i>	<i>Good</i> <i>15-17</i>	<i>Very Good</i> <i>18-22</i>	Overall Section Mark
STYLE AND PRESENTATION (weight = 15%) e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> quality of English (vocabulary/grammar) clarity structure and balance between sections use of notation quality of diagrams and tables referencing of the literature 	Unclear with errors.	Unclear.	Variable clarity.	Generally clear and sound.	High quality.	Excellent.	
QUALITY OF DESCRIPTION (weight = 25%) e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> project background data collection study design description of statistical methods 	Incoherent description of context/design/methods.	Poor description of context/design/methods; substantial defects in statistical/mathematical arguments.	Coherent but sketchy description of context/design/methods.	Fairly clear description of context/design /methods; with indications of some thought.	Clear description of context/design/methods, with indications of considerable thought.	Very clear, concise description of context/design/methods, with indications of outstandingly good thought.	
APPROACH (weight = 35%) e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> understanding of aims and statistical issues quality of general approach quality of scrutiny of literature understanding of relevant theory appropriateness and justification of choice of statistical methods application of statistical methods 	No understanding apparent. Incorrect and inaccurate use of statistical techniques and/or no engagement with the literature.	Little understanding apparent. Inappropriate and/or inaccurate use of statistical techniques and/or limited engagement with the literature.	Basic but inadequate understanding. Not always appropriate choice of statistical techniques. Adequate but uninspired engagement with the literature.	Adequate understanding of issues. Generally appropriate and sound use of statistical techniques and/or the literature	Considerable depth of understanding of issues. Appropriate, accurate and sound use of statistical techniques. A good study of the literature.	An Exceptional understanding of issues. Assiduous, precise and concise use of statistical techniques; Comprehensive engagement with the literature.	
CONCLUSION/ INTERPRETATION (weight = 25%) e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> appropriateness of conclusions drawn understanding of implications and limitations possibilities for further work/extension 	Incorrect conclusions and interpretation, no evidence of understanding of implications and/or limitations.	Lacking understanding; poor interpretation, inadequate evidence of understanding of implications and/or limitations.	Understanding of relevant issues; weak interpretation, evidence of minimum understanding of implications and limitations.	Appropriate conclusions and interpretation, evidence of some understanding of implications and limitations.	Thoroughly appropriate interpretation, evidence of good understanding of implications and limitations.	Exceptionally good insights; appropriate conclusions, in-depth understanding of implications and limitations.	

Student name:

Project short title:

Comments by the examiner (please try to address each of the criteria above in your comments):