

## **1. ARGUMENT**

We are looking to see that the team have constructed effective arguments as introduced during week 3 of the Learning Skills course, including considering a range of relevant viewpoints, before forming their own interpretation based upon the collected evidence.

### ***1.1 Description or analysis? We are looking for the team to have analysed information, concepts or ideas, not simply to have described them:***

- (3) The team have attempted to analyse all of the key concepts or viewpoints in their report
- (2) With a few exceptions the team have generally attempted to analyse concepts or viewpoints
- (1) There is some limited evidence of analysis, although the report is mostly descriptive
- (0) There is no evidence of analysis within the report

### ***1.2 The report includes a range of different arguments:***

- (3) A broad range of arguments have been covered leading to a nicely balanced response
- (2) The report includes a reasonable range of different viewpoints which provide some balance
- (1) A limited number of arguments have been presented, for instance a single line of argument for each of 'the case for' and 'the case against'
- (0) The report lacks any meaningful lines of argument

### ***1.3 The arguments are directly relevant to the question the team set out to undertake:***

- (3) Each of the arguments is linked directly to the question set
- (2) Although the report sometimes drifts off topic, the arguments are generally relevant
- (1) The arguments within the report are only loosely related to the question
- (0) The response bears little relation to the question the team set out to answer

### ***1.4 The team have compared different ideas or theories, not simply looking at them in isolation:***

- (3) The report includes numerous examples of the team comparing different theories or ideas
- (2) Although inconsistent, on a number of occasions the team have compared theories or ideas
- (1) In general, different ideas or theories are considered in isolation with no comparisons drawn
- (0) There are no meaningful arguments presented in the report

### ***1.5 Overall, does the report suggest the team approached the question with an open mind i.e. brainstorming, following different lines of thought, letting evidence guide their research/thinking?***

- (3) The team's thinking seems to have been guided by the information they collected and they have embraced some interesting or original arguments, possibly as a result of brainstorming and reflection
- (2) Although there is some evidence that the team approached the question with an open mind they were perhaps a little rigid in their thinking and might have developed a broader range of topics (some of which may have been mentioned in the report but given little attention)
- (1) The report suggests the team set out to prove some pre-conceived ideas and didn't really challenge their own thinking
- (0) There are no meaningful arguments in the report

## **2. EVIDENCE**

We are looking to see that the team have undertaken effective research as covered during week 2 of the course, using a range of different information sources. We are also looking to see that the team have critically reviewed the quality of sources and acknowledged others' work (as per week 5 of the course).

### ***2.1 The team have supported arguments with evidence:***

- (3) Arguments are supported by evidence throughout the report
- (2) Most of the key arguments are supported by evidence although there are some clear omissions
- (1) The report includes some limited evidence although it is generally lacking
- (0) The report includes little or no supporting evidence

### ***2.2 The team have used relevant evidence that is appropriate for academic study:***

- (3) Evidence in the report is consistently relevant and sufficiently weighty for academic work
- (2) The evidence in the report is mostly relevant and of sufficient academic merit
- (1) With a few exceptions, the report lacks appropriate evidence
- (0) The report includes little or no evidence of appropriate quality or relevance to the topic

### ***2.3 Evidence has been provided from a range of different sources (e.g. texts, journals, Internet):***

- (3) The team have undertaken extensive research, using a range of different sources
- (2) The team have consulted two or three types of media, although there is an over reliance on one source e.g. the Internet
- (1) Research has generally been restricted to one or two types of source, rather than a broad range
- (0) Little or no effort has been made to consult different sources

### ***2.4 Sources of evidence are acknowledged in the text, using Harvard correctly (see guidelines):***

- (3) The team have grasped when and how to reference and have generally done so effectively
- (2) Overall, the team have made a decent effort to cite references even if it has not always been done successfully or when required
- (1) Referencing has been attempted from time-to-time and with variable success
- (0) No attempt has been made to reference evidence within the text

### ***2.5 The report includes a reference list prepared using Harvard (see guidelines)***

- (3) The team have made a good effort to prepare a list that matches or is very close to that required
- (2) Despite some errors, the team have made a decent effort to correctly prepare references
- (1) The reference list looks to be a token effort, possibly a hastily prepared list
- (0) The report does not include a reference list

### ***2.6 The report includes a bibliography outlining all sources including background reading***

- (3) The bibliography is prepared appropriately and shows evidence of useful background reading
- (2) The team have prepared a bibliography, although it suggests little evidence of background reading – it is the reference list with one or two additions.
- (1) The bibliography looks to be a token effort, possibly a short, hastily prepared list
- (0) The report does not include a bibliography

### 3. STRUCTURE

We are looking to see that the team have prepared a clearly structured report as outlined during week 4:

**3.1 The report includes a cover sheet with: course title; correct project title; date; word count; personal tutor and; group members:**

- (3) The cover sheet provides all of the information stipulated
- (2) The cover sheet lists most, but not all of the stipulated information
- (1) The cover sheet lacks several of the stipulated criteria
- (0) The report doesn't have a cover sheet

**3.2 The report includes a clear introductory section that 'sets the scene' and demonstrates the group's interpretation of the question, by providing: key background information to the topic; definitions of key terms where appropriate and; a clear demonstration of intent for the report:**

- (3) Introduction provides all of the stipulated characteristics and sets the scene effectively
- (2) Introduction includes most, but not all of the stipulated characteristics
- (1) Introduction offered but lacks many of the stipulated characteristics
- (0) No introduction offered

**3.3 The report includes a clear main body including: the key arguments the group has chosen to explore; logical progression of arguments; subheadings for key sections; consistency with what is outlined in the introduction:**

- (3) Main body matches all of the expected characteristics
- (2) Main body includes many, but not all of the characteristics above
- (1) Main body lacks many of the characteristics stipulated above
- (0) No main body offered – it is hard to see where the introduction ends and the conclusion begins

**3.4 The report includes a clearly identified conclusion that: summarises the key arguments covered within the report; does not introduce new material; makes a concluding statement that links back to the original question; draws the report to a natural close:**

- (3) Conclusion fulfils all the criteria listed above, drawing the report to a natural close
- (2) Conclusion includes most, but not all of the characteristics above
- (1) Conclusion offered but lacks many of the characteristics stipulated above
- (0) No conclusion offered

**3.5 Overall, the report reads as a cohesive response to the question, not a series of individual essays:**

- (3) The report flows naturally from beginning to end and reads as a single response to the question
- (2) With a few exceptions, the different sections of the report generally link well together
- (1) There is some limited cohesion although it does not read as a single response to the question
- (0) Not achieved - the report is a 'cobbled together' collection of individual pieces

#### 4. PRESENTATION

We are looking for evidence that the team have attempted to write in an academic style and have carefully proof read the report before submission, as covered during week 4 of the Learning Skills course:

**4.1 The report demonstrates good grammar, including spelling and punctuation:**

- (3) Few grammatical errors and the report seems to have been spellchecked and thoroughly proofed
- (2) The report generally shows good grammar with some occasional mistakes – perhaps the team did not re-read the report after putting it through a spell check?
- (1) The quality of grammar varies between different sections of the report
- (0) The report is littered with grammatical errors

**4.2 The language used in the report is appropriate, for example: it is neutral and non-emotive; it is written passively; it is succinct and clear; it is written in continuous prose:**

- (3) Appropriate language has been used throughout and it reads like an academic report or essay
- (2) Although not consistently the case, the report is generally written in an appropriate style
- (1) With some exceptions, the team have generally failed to grasp how to write in an academic way
- (0) The team have made little or no effort to write in an academic style

**4.3 The report matches the stylesheet outlined in the brief (see notes) including: font and type size; line spacing; margins; numbered single pages; subheadings:**

- (3) The report is consistent with all aspects of the stylesheet
- (2) The team have adhered to most, but not all of the guidelines in the stylesheet
- (1) There is some limited evidence that the team have considered the stylesheet
- (0) The team have ignored the stylesheet

**4.4 The report falls within 10% of the agreed word count of 2500 (excluding appendices):**

- (3) The report falls between 2250 and 2750 words
- (0) The report is fewer than 2250 words, or longer than 2750 words

**MARKER COMMENTS:**

FINAL MARK OUT OF 60: ..... x 1.66= ..... %

SIGNATURE OF MARKER: .....

DATE: .....