

Computer Science & Big Data Analytics Honours Research Report Marking Guide

**Assessment Time Period:
December 2 2020 - December 8 2020**

Acknowledgement

This marking scheme is adapted from the version compiled by Mike Mchunu, and based on Professor Ian Sander's research report marking scheme.

Student Number -----

Student Name -----

Project Title -----

Project Supervisor -----

Research Report Assessor -----

Assessment Date -----

Supervisor/Assessor's Mark (%) -----

Document Component	Assessment	Allocation	Rating (%)	Awarded (%)
Abstract				
• Provides context	Absent	0.0	... * 1.0	
• Idea of own contribution	Very poor	1.0		
• What will be done	Poor	1.5		
• How it will be done	Adequate	2.5		
• Can be read independently	Good	3.5		
• Measures (metrics) used and results	Very good	4.5		
	Excellent	5.0		
Introduction				
• Introduces general problem area	Absent	0.0	... * 2.0	
• Introduces specific problem area	Very poor	1.0		
• Introduces research to be followed	Poor	1.5		
• Provides idea about expected results	Adequate	2.5		
• Provides idea of research contribution	Good	3.5		
• Correct level of detail?	Very good	4.5		
• Provides structure to rest of document	Excellent	5.0		
Background				
• Provides detail on specific problem area	Absent	0.0	... * 2.0	
• Level of engagement with research literature	Very poor	1.0		
• Level of understanding of problem background	Poor	1.5		
• Contains adequate and relevant references	Adequate	2.5		
• Contains relevant ideas, concepts, etc., from references	Good	3.5		
• Relates background material and related work to research question	Very good	4.5		
• Research aim/question justified in terms of past research	Excellent	5.0		
Research Problem/Hypothesis/Question				
• Has justified the validity of research problem/hypothesis/question	Absent	0.0	... * 1.0	
• Has clearly stated research problem/hypothesis/question	Very poor	1.0		
• Research problem/hypothesis/question can be solved/tested/answered	Poor	1.5		
	Adequate	2.5		
	Good	3.5		
	Very good	4.5		
	Excellent	5.0		
Research Methodology				
• It is presented	Absent	0.0	... * 4.0	
• It appears to be a reasonable approach	Very poor	1.0		
• It will lead to verification or refutation of research hypothesis	Poor	1.5		
• It will lead to answering of the research question	Adequate	2.5		
• Student has identified data to be collected/measurements to be made	Good	3.5		
• Student has motivated why data or measurements have been selected	Very good	4.5		
• Overall, the research method seems to be reasonable	Excellent	5.0		
• Overall, the research method seems to be feasible				
Results				
• Presented clearly & well organized	Absent	0.0	... * 6.0	
• Enough collected to test hypothesis or answer questions	Very poor	1.0		
• Student understands results (discussion)	Poor	1.5		
• Student has related results to research problem/hypothesis/question	Adequate	2.5		
• Student has discussed limitation(s) of own research	Good	3.5		
• Student has placed own work into context with other research	Very good	4.5		
• Student has discussed own level of contribution	Excellent	5.0		
• Code visibility or availability				

Document Component	Assessment	Allocation	Rating (%)	Awarded (%)
Conclusion				
• It provides a summary of the major points of the report	Absent	0.0	... * 1.0	
• It does summarize the document	Very poor	1.0		
• It brings together the main points	Poor	1.5		
• It highlights most important results	Adequate	2.5		
• It makes clear student's own contribution	Good	3.5		
• Some ideas for future work presented	Very good	4.5		
• Some discussion of other ways of addressing the same problem	Excellent	5.0		
Presentation				
• The general layout and "look" of the document is acceptable	Absent	0.0	... * 2.0	
• The figures are large enough and the pages are numbered	Very poor	1.0		
• The graphs are clear, well labelled and properly captioned	Poor	1.5		
• The tables are well laid out and properly captioned	Adequate	2.5		
• Document structure is acceptable	Good	3.5		
• Document is written in decent English with correct spelling	Very good	4.5		
• Section breakdown is acceptable	Excellent	5.0		
References				
• References are complete	Absent	0.0	... * 1.0	
• References are accurate	Very poor	1.0		
• References are cited in the approved style	Poor	1.5		
	Adequate	2.5		
	Good	3.5		
	Very good	4.5		
	Excellent	5.0		

TOTAL MARK - - - - - %