

Student name: _____

Project short title: _____

Examiner's initials: _____

Mark assigned: _____ (to 2 decimal places)

This form is for marking MSc/MRes (STATS5029P) project reports. The first block of four sections ("style and presentation", "approach", "quality of explanation" and "conclusion/interpretation") relates to the part of the project that is core; these four should be given an individual mark between 0 and 22 based on the headings (Poor, Weak etc..) and the heading descriptors. The fifth block relates to the freestyle chapter, which gets a 0-22 mark too. To help the marker decide on a mark for each section, some examples of characteristics to be assessed in that section are listed. Each marker's report mark is the sum of the individual section marks multiplied by their associated weights. There are two examiners, who mark projects independently; their marks are averaged. However, if there is a discrepancy of 3 marks or more, 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. Each examiner should provide general comments on page 2, touching upon each of the five broad criteria below. The final report grade on the 22-point scale is then combined with the grade from the interim assessment as described in the Project guidelines. **Please return the form electronically to Kathleen Mosson (kathleen.mosson@glasgow.ac.uk).**

	<i>Criterion</i>	<i>Poor 0-5</i>	<i>Weak 6-8</i>	<i>Acceptable 9-11</i>	<i>Moderate 12-14</i>	<i>Good 15-17</i>	<i>Very Good 18-22</i>	Overall Section Mark
CORE	STYLE AND PRESENTATION (weight = 10%) e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> clarity of style structure and balance between sections use of notation quality of diagrams and tables quality of reporting R code correct referencing style 	Unclear with errors.	Unclear.	Variable clarity.	Generally clear and sound.	High quality.	Generally excellent.	<div></div>
	APPROACH (weight = 22.5%) e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> understanding of aims and statistical issues appropriateness of choice of statistical methods, including visualizations, models, fitting, model selection, diagnostics, etc correctness of application of statistical methods correctness of R code quality of scrutiny of literature understanding of relevant theory 	No understanding apparent. Incorrect and inaccurate use of statistical techniques and/or the literature.	Little understanding apparent. Inappropriate and/or inaccurate use of statistical techniques and or shallow use of literature.	Sensible but inadequate understanding. Not always appropriate choice of statistical techniques. Adequate but uninspired pursuit of literature.	Understanding of issues. Generally appropriate and sound use of statistical techniques and/or the literature.	Appreciable depth of understanding of issues. Appropriate, accurate and sound use of statistical techniques. A good study of the literature.	A very sound understanding of issues. Exceptionally assiduous, precise and concise; very high quality throughout.	<div></div>
	QUALITY OF EXPLANATION (weight = 15%) e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> project background how data were collected study design (where applicable) description of statistical methods justification for choice of statistical methods 	Incoherent.	Poor exposition; substantial defects in mathematical arguments.	Coherent but sketchy exposition.	Fairly clear and coherent exposition.	Mostly clear exposition, with clear indications of thought.	Very clear, concise with clear indications of outstandingly good thought.	<div></div>
	CONCLUSIONS/ INTERPRETATION (weight = 15%) e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> appropriateness of conclusions drawn understanding of implications and limitations 	Incorrect conclusions and interpretation.	Lacking understanding; poor interpretation.	Understanding of relevant issues; weak interpretation.	Appropriate conclusions and interpretation.	Thoroughly appropriate interpretation, evidence of good understanding.	Exceptionally good insights; appropriate conclusion with good understanding of implications and limitations.	<div></div>
FREESTYLE CHAPTER	INDEPENDENT CHAPTER (weight = 37.5%) e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> appropriate extension scale of ambition correctness possibilities for further work/extension any of the criteria in the four sections above 	Little sign of meaningful extension.	Some extension proposed but not appropriate or poorly delivered.	Extension attempted but with inconsistencies of approach.	Worthwhile extension to the core, but with limited ambition. Moderately well implemented.	Appropriate ideas; competently but not necessarily flawlessly done; some critical thinking apparent	Exceptionally good ideas; accurately implemented; and critically discussed	<div></div>

Student name: _____

Project short title: _____

Comments by the examiner: