Student Name:			Student Number:	
Grade Band	**Thesis definition and scope (10%)**		**Background (20%)**	
Excellent (85-100%)	Excellent, clear definition of a substantial and significant project topic, problem and/or hypothesis (including statement of purpose and relevance) and scope (including context, boundaries and assumptions). The abstract accurately yet concisely captures the project topic, methods and outcomes.	10 9	Extensive, relevant and logically organised review, analysis, discussion of background material, both specific research and general theory, helps the reader understand the rest of the document, and demonstrates clear mastery of the material in the topic area and ability to synthesize and abstract knowledge.	20 18 17
Very Good (75-84%)	Very good definition of project topic, problem and/or hypothesis (including statement of purpose and relevance) and scope (including context, boundaries and assumptions). The abstract accurately captures the project topic, methods and outcomes.	8	Relevant and logically organised review, analysis, discussion of background material, both specific research and general theory, helps the reader understand the rest of the document, and demonstrates mastery of the material in the topic area and ability to synthesize and abstract knowledge.	16 15
Good (65-74%)	Good definition of project topic, problem and/or hypothesis (including statement of purpose) and scope (including assumptions). The abstract captures the project topic and outcomes	7	Good review/discussion of background material, with both specific research and general theory, and shows good understanding of the material in the topic area and ability to synthesize and abstract knowledge.	14 13
Satisfactory (50-64%)	Satisfactory definition of project topic, problem and/or hypothesis and scope. The abstract satisfactorily captures the project topic and outcomes	6 5	Acceptable coverage of background material, with both specific research and general theory, and shows basic understanding of the material in the topic area.	12 11 10
Poor (25-49%)	Poor or incomplete definition of project topic and scope. The abstract is not clear about the project topic and its outcomes	4 3	A limited coverage of background material, which perhaps does not cover both specific research and general theory. Flaws in the basic understanding of the material in the topic area are evident.	9 7 5
Very Poor (0-24%)	Project topic and scope are very unclear. The abstract does not summarise the project topic and its outcomes. External work heavily used without academic merit.	2 1 0	An extremely limited coverage of background material. A lack of understanding of the material in the topic area is clear. External work heavily used without academic merit.	4 2 0
Comments:				

Mark Sheet - Final Report - DATA7902 - Page 2

Student Name:	Student Number:		Supervisor/Examiner:	
Grade Band	**Approach and execution (45%)**		**Conclusion (15%)**	
Excellent (85-100%)	A clearly set out plan with goals and methods systematically follows from the background research. The approach highlights your creativity and innovation and includes an evaluation of alternative approaches. The execution indicates a substantial work effort, and shows the application of knowledge gained from background research. The project results are complete and comprehensively presented and analysed.	45 / 42 / 39	The analysis of the work conducted highlights your comprehension and shows insight into the significance of the results. The report has a critical review of your performance against the stated plan. The report concludes with a clear concise summary of the outcomes – in context of specified project definitions and literature – and brings recommendations for continuation and improvement of the work.	15 / 14 / 13
Very Good (75-84%)	A clearly set out plan with goals and methods systematically follows from the background research. The approach shows innovation and includes an evaluation of alternative approaches. The actual execution of work shows the application of knowledge gained from background research and indicates a very good effort. The project results are complete and comprehensively presented and analysed.	38 / 36 / 34	The analysis of the work conducted shows comprehension and some insight into the significance of the results. The report has a critical review of your performance against the stated plan. The report concludes with a clear summary of the outcomes – in context of specified project definitions and literature – and brings recommendations for continuation and improvement of the work.	12
Good (65-74%)	A plan of work follows from the background research. The approach is systematic and includes some consideration of alternative approaches. The execution of work shows the application of knowledge gained from background research and a good effort. The project results are mostly complete, well presented and analysed.	33 / 30	The analysis of the work conducted shows comprehension of the project but limited insight into the significance of the results. The report has a critical review of your performance. The report concludes with a summary of the outcomes and brings recommendations for continuation of the work.	11 / 10
Satisfactory (50-64%)	A satisfactory plan of work is offered. The approach is reasonably systematic. The actual execution of work shows reasonable understanding via some application of prior knowledge and some background research, it also shows satisfactory effort in the project. The project results are complete in the larger part, sufficiently presented and analysed.	29 / 26 / 23	The analysis of the work conducted demonstrates some comprehension. The report has a critical review of your performance. The report concludes with a summary of outcomes.	9 / 8
Poor (25-49%)	The plan of work offered is incomplete or unclear. The approach is not well considered, and does not logically flow from the background research presented. The actual execution of work shows flawed understanding and little application of the either background research or prior knowledge, its fails to show satisfactory effort in project. Project results poor, and/or poorly presented.	22 / 17 / 12	The analysis of the work conducted demonstrates limited comprehension. The report concludes with a poor summary of outcomes.	7 / 5 / 4
Very Poor (0-24%)	The plan of work, if offered, is not sensible. The approach is haphazard, and has no logical basis. The actual execution of work shows very little understanding or application of the either background research or prior knowledge. Project results not on the level for postgraduate project work. External work heavily used without academic merit.	11 / 5 / 0	There is a very poor review of the work and no real comprehension demonstrated. The report concludes fails to explain what was achieved.	3 / 1 / 0
Final Mark: /90	**Comments:**			
	Supervisor/Examiner's Signature:		**Date:**	

| Student Name: | mark / 15: converted to /10 |

Grade Band	Genre		Register
	Purpose	**Structure**	**Audience**
Very Good (5)	The opening succinctly establishes the purpose, and previews the contents of the document.	Document contains all structural elements in an appropriate and logical order (summarises the full report in 1 page).	All expressions are appropriate to written communication, and carefully targeted to a mixed audience.
Good (3)	The opening contains unnecessary information that distracts from the document's purpose and contents.	Some minor elements are missing or not presented in the right order	Some expressions are not adequately paraphrased, or show a lack of sensitivity towards the mixed audience.
Poor (1)	Purpose and outline provided in the opening do not properly reflect the content of the report	Parts of the structure are mixed or hard to distinguish	Most of the terms are left unexplained, leaving important points inaccessible to most readers.
Very Poor (0)	Purpose of the document is unclear, or no outline has been provided for its contents.	An essential part or parts of the structure are missing.	Expressions generally sound too casual or unprofessional or written with spoken colloquial expressions.

Grade Band	Discourse Semantics		
	Coherence	**Cohesion**	**Positioning**
Very Good (5)	All topic sentences are clearly presented at the start of each segment, and fully developed.	All paragraphs use appropriate lexical ties and known-new arrangement to link sentences and paragraphs.	Expressions generally sound objective, while positioning is appropriate and highly persuasive.
Good (3)	Some paragraphs contain multiple topic sentences, or the topic sentence is unnecessarily delayed.	The development is generally clear, but some lexical ties have been left implicit, requiring readers to infer the meaning.	Expressions sound objective but lack persuasiveness, or sources cited are poorly positioned.
Poor (1)	Topic sentences are difficult to locate in some segments, or paragraphs are not developed.	Lexical ties and known-new arrangements are significantly lacking, causing the writing to seem disjointed.	Some expressions sound too subjective or inconsistent, or sources cited appear vague.
Very Poor (0)	Topic sentences are generally absent, and the writing appears to digress aimlessly.	Lexical ties are wrongly used or known-new arrangements are largely absent, rendering ideas very difficult to follow.	Positioning is inappropriate, causing the writing to appear very personal or idiosyncratic.

Grade Band	Lexicogrammar		Graphology	Page 2
	Sentence Structure	**Clear Writing**	**Spelling & Punctuation**	**Formatting & References**
Very Good (5)	All sentences are correct, start with important information, and are easy to understand.	Writing communicates clearly, by minimizing nominalization, vague terms, and ineffective verbs.	Writing is carefully proofread and completely free of spelling and punctuation errors	Spacing, font size, script, etc. are professionally presented, with all references consistent and complete.
Good (3)	Sentences contain noticeable grammatical errors, or are unnecessarily complicated.	Writing contains a noticeable amount of nominalization, vague terms, or ineffective verbs.	Writing contains minor but noticeable careless spelling or punctuation errors.	References are complete and consistent, but spacing, font size, script, etc. are poorly presented.
Poor (1)	Many sentences do not start with important information or contains significant errors.	Writing contains a substantial amount of nominalization, vague terms, or ineffective verbs.	Writing appears unprofessional with systematic spelling or punctuation errors.	References are incomplete, inconsistent or poorly presented.
Very Poor (0)	Sentences are poorly phrased or have significant errors that render them difficult to read.	Writing is full of noun clusters, jargon, and ineffective verbs, making the writing difficult to interpret.	Writing has significant spelling or punctuation errors, making it difficult to read.	Document is presented in a haphazard manner, or references are missing.
Comments:				