

Preliminary Research Article (15% mark of the total module)
Marking Scheme

Literature Review (10%)

Quality of Writing - 3%

Excellent 1st (100%-85%)	1st (84%-70%)	2:1 (69%-60%)	2:2 (59%-50%)	3rd (49%-40%)	Marginal Fail (39%-35%)	Fail (34%-0%)
Exceptional writing. No typo and grammatical errors. The narrative reads exceptionally well.	Excellent writing. Negligible typo and grammatical errors. The narrative is excellent.	Very good writing. Minor typo and grammatical errors. Mostly readable, but could benefit from minor improvements.	Good writing. A few typo and grammatical errors. Mostly readable, but could be improved.	Satisfactory writing. Frequent typo and grammatical errors. Readable, but the narrative could be largely improved.	Unsatisfactory and poor writing. Widespread typo and grammatical errors. Poor construction of sentences.	Very poor writing. Widespread typo and grammatical errors, very poor construction of sentences. Unreadable.

Coverage and Content of Review – 5%

Excellent 1st (100%-85%)	1st (84%-70%)	2:1 (69%-60%)	2:2 (59%-50%)	3rd (49%-40%)	Marginal Fail (39%-35%)	Fail (34%-0%)
Exceptional, comprehensive coverage of state-of-the-art in the review. Critique of research and how it relates to the research project is exceptional. An expert may expand their knowledge by reading the review.	Excellent, comprehensive coverage of state-of-the-art in the review. Critique of research and how it relates to the research project is exceptional. An expert may glean something they didn't know before from the review.	Comprehensive coverage of state-of-the-art in the review. Adequate content with no unrelated content. Critique of research and how it relates to the research project is very good. An expert in the subject area could be interested in reading the review.	Good coverage of state-of-the-art in the review, but could have covered more and minimum content is unrelated/irrelevant. Critique of research and how it relates to the research project is good.	Satisfactory coverage of state-of-the-art in the review, but quite a lot is missing and some content is unrelated/irrelevant. Factually accurate. Critique of research and how it relates to the research project is satisfactory.	Unsatisfactory and poor coverage of state-of-the-art in the review. Factually inaccurate statements. No critique and relation to the research project is present.	Unsatisfactory and very poor coverage of state-of-the-art in the review. The review is of little to no value. Factually inaccurate statements. No critique and relation to the research project is present.

Referencing – 2%						
Excellent 1st (100%-85%)	1st (84%-70%)	2:1 (69%-60%)	2:2 (59%-50%)	3rd (49%-40%)	Marginal Fail (39%-35%)	Fail (34%-0%)
References are exceptional quality articles and of publication standard. Review is exceptionally well referenced. Consistency of references and adherence to a single format is exceptional.	References are excellent quality articles and of publication standard. Use of references is excellent in the review. Consistency of references and adherence to a single format is excellent.	References are very good. Use of references is very good, but may have missed in a few places. There are no inconsistencies in the references and adhere to a single format.	References are good. Use of reference is good, but may have missed in many places. There are no inconsistencies in the references and adhere to a single format.	References are satisfactory. Use of references is satisfactory, but has missed in many places. There are a few inconsistencies in the references and do not fully adhere to a single format.	Very few references, poor bibliography. There are many inconsistencies in the references, if present.	No attempt to indicate source.
Progress of Research (5%)						
Excellent 1st (100%-85%)	1st (84%-70%)	2:1 (69%-60%)	2:2 (59%-50%)	3rd (49%-40%)	Marginal Fail (39%-35%)	Fail (34%-0%)
Exceptional progress noted. Exceptional steps made towards undertaking the research, advanced experimentation carried out, on track to make exceptional research contributions. Demonstrates an exceptional understanding and command of the research area.	Excellent progress noted. Excellent steps made towards undertaking the research, more than preliminary experimentation carried out, on track to make excellent research contributions. Demonstrates an excellent understanding of the research area.	Very good progress noted. Concrete steps made towards undertaking the research, preliminary experimentation carried out, initial results obtained. Understanding of research area is very good.	Good progress noted. Basic steps taken to undertake the research, preliminary experimentation carried out. There may be a few gaps in the understanding of the research area.	Some progress noted. Basic steps taken to undertake the research. There are significant gaps in the understanding of the research area.	Progress unsatisfactory. No preliminary steps taken to undertake the research. An understanding of the research area is not evidenced.	No progress.