**UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG**

**School of Computer Science**

**IRM**

**PHASE 4**

**Annotated Bibliography - Mark Scheme**

Student:

Marker:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Marks | Comments |
| **Structure and Style** **(20)**  (Written in decent  English with correct spelling?  English with correct spelling?  Full sentences unnecessary, but  must be understandable.) |  |  |
| **Presentation**  (Look of document—  general layout etc.) |  |  |
| **Plagiarism**  Any evidence of plagiarism (Is  phrasing sufficiently different from  original text?) |  |  |
| **References**   * How available were references relating to the research question? * How relevant are the chosen references to the research question? * How difficult was the material * the student had to deal with? * (very easy, relatively straightforward, some difficult sections, most of the material was difficult, etc) * In relation to difficulty of material, how do you rate the work? (exceptional, above average, average,below average) * If you were assigning marks, * which class would the mark fall into (first, upper second, second,third, fail) |  |  |
| **General comments (if any, please use additional paper if necessary) (see over-leaf)** |  |  |
| Paper 1  Paper 2  Paper 3  Paper 4  Paper 5  Paper 6  Paper 7 |  |  |
|  |  |  |

For each of the papers 1 through to 6 or 7, please give a mark from the following mark scheme.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Mark |
| **Aims** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 the aims of the paper are given accurately  1 the aims of the paper are given, but only partly or with  some inaccuracy  0 no aims are given at all |
| **Main Points** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 the annotation contains accurately and fully the main  points of the paper, including method and results  4 the annotation contains most of the main points  3 most of the main points are covered, but there are  some inaccuracies  2 some of the main points are covered, but there are major  omissions or inaccuracies  1 it is not clear that the student had any understanding of the  paper at all  0 no main points are given at all |
| **Detail** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 sufficient detail is given considering space constraints  1 the annotation is superficial  0 the annotation gives no indication of what the paper  is about |
| **Crossreferences** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Note:** Take into account the relatedness of the articles. If the articles were not very related, then mark in terms of what cross-referencing was possible  5 the cross-references are clear, complete and accurate  4 the cross-references are mostly clear, complete and accurate  3 there are a few missing cross-references, there is some lack of clarity or a few mistakes  2 there are some missing cross-references, some lack of clarity or some inaccuracies  1 the cross-references are very unclear, they are mostly inaccurate, or there are obvious cross-references which are missing  0 there are no cross-references at all |
| **References and**  **citations** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 the reference and citations are correct and done in departmental style  1 there are mistakes in the reference or citations or the incorrect style has been used  0 there are mistakes in the reference or citations and the incorrect style has been used |
| **Type** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 the type is indicated (theory paper, survey, experiment, book chapter, journal article, conference paper etc.)  0 there is no indication of the type |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 |