

<b>Assignment 1</b>					
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>100 to &gt; 80% Outstanding</b>	<b>80 to &gt; 65% Excellent</b>	<b>65 to &gt; 5% Good</b>	<b>50 to &gt; 35% Fair</b>	<b>35 to &gt; 0% Unsatisfactory</b>
Method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>System design is admirably clear and unquestionably structured to provide testable hypotheses which will provide knowledge for the given problem</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilises relevant methodological strategies which are connected to logical hypotheses</li> <li>System design is clear and reproducible, but some minor ideas are overlooked</li> <li>Evaluation is systematic and logical</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilises relevant methodological strategies which are connected to plausible hypotheses</li> <li>Parameters unidentified or not contrasted</li> <li>Description of the system design is missing some important ideas, making the design questionable or dubious</li> <li>Evaluation is logical but not systematic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilises methodological strategies, but incompletely, or disconnected from corresponding hypotheses, or fundamentally limit the prospect of gaining knowledge</li> <li>Description of system design lacks several crucial methodological components</li> <li>Data representation not appropriate for chosen methods</li> <li>Evaluation is attempted but illogical</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Methodological strategies are essentially incomplete or absent</li> </ul>
Critical Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task</li> <li>Argumentation is logical and thoroughly supported by evidence</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are understood and linked to practical behaviour</li> <li>Demonstrates a very high level of abstract thought</li> <li>Admirably situated with respect to the academic community</li> <li>Publishable with perhaps minor changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly identifies the knowledge gained about the task</li> <li>Argumentation is logical and thoroughly supported by evidence</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are well-understood and linked to practical behaviour</li> <li>Demonstrates a moderate level of abstract thought</li> <li>Attempts to situate with respect to the academic community, but perhaps not clearly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attempts to identify the knowledge gained about the task, but vague or unclear</li> <li>Argumentation is logical, but the evidence is lacking in some areas</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are understood, but not clearly linked to practical behaviours</li> <li>Demonstrates abstract thought, but extended analysis not always clear or successful</li> <li>Little connection to the academic community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Knowledge gained about the task is fundamentally flawed or lacking</li> <li>Argumentation is illogical in places, and evidence is inadequate or contradictory</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are not in evidence</li> <li>No signs of abstract thought and/or analysis</li> <li>No connection to the academic community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No indication of knowledge gained about the task</li> <li>Argumentation is generally absent</li> <li>Most data without a corresponding analysis</li> <li>Theoretical properties of methods are not in evidence</li> <li>No connection to the academic community</li> </ul>
Report Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ideas and arguments are cohesive, where the components of the report clearly indicate how they relate to the whole</li> <li>Report structure is logical and formal, in line with typical standards in academic writing</li> <li>Generally clear and easy-to-follow</li> <li>References are suitably synthesised and chosen discriminately with respect to the given problem</li> <li>Adequately concise and meets word limits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ideas and arguments are coherent, and generally the work fits together as a unit</li> <li>Report structure is logical and formal, with small divergences from typical academic standards</li> <li>Generally clear, with small disruptions in the flow</li> <li>References are suitably synthesised but are too few or chosen indiscriminately</li> <li>Adequately concise and meets word limits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ideas and arguments are mostly coherent but do not come together in a unified way</li> <li>Report structure is logical, but possibly informal or out-of-line with academic standards</li> <li>Some unclear sections that do not detract from the overall work</li> <li>References are present but disconnected from the problem at hand</li> <li>Perhaps small divergences from the word limits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ideas and arguments are notably incoherent</li> <li>Report structure is flawed</li> <li>Some unclear sections which detract from the overall work</li> <li>References are disconnected or absent</li> <li>Possibly way off the word limits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ideas and arguments are missing or impossible to follow</li> <li>Report has no structure or references</li> <li>Not a formal report, even at a stretch</li> </ul>