

Interdisciplinary and Group Processes

HCCS MSc

Marking Criteria

Convenor: Richard Cox
(richc Chi 1 CI102)
Tutor: Johanna Hunt
(johannah Pev 3 3C11)

<http://www.informatics.sussex.ac.uk/users/johannah/IGP/>

Term II, Spring 2010

85% -- 100%: An outstanding report. The student will have performed an extremely well organised and articulated piece of work. There will be clear evidence of relevant background research, identifying literature which goes well beyond the material presented in the seminars. There will be evidence of a mature understanding of the issues involved. The discussion will demonstrate an insightful critical analysis of the issues involved. The report will be on word limit +/- 10%, and be concise. In short, the report should be superbly organized and presented and lucidly written, showing evidence of independent research, original thought and insightful discussion.

70% -- 84%: Students will show a thorough understanding and appreciation of the report material with no significant error or omission. There will be evidence of relevant background research. The report will display excellent organisational and presentational skills. To get this score the report should resemble the higher band but may be less coherent and original. The report will be on word limit +/- 10%.

60% -- 69%: Students will show a clear understanding of the technical and professional issues involved. Some issues may have been overlooked, but the report will be organised and written to a high standard. There will be evidence of some independent research that goes beyond the basics. At this level organisation can be messier with more redundancy and 'filler', but the report should cover all the basics, and build on them. The report will be on word limit +/- 10%.

50% -- 59%: The report should demonstrate that the student has sufficient understanding of the material. The presentation and organization of the report should be reasonably clear. There may be some signs of weakness, but overall the grasp of the topic should be sound. The report must cover all the basics, show research beyond that presented in seminars, and show a reasonable understanding of the issues. The report might deviate from the word limit.

40% -- 49%: The report will indicate a basic understanding of the material, and a basic evaluation, but will not have gone much beyond this. There may well be signs of confusion about more complex material. At this level the report basics should be covered and understanding of basic concepts/issues shown, but there will be little evidence of research beyond seminars and demonstrate limited insight. Organisation can be scrappy and English not that good. The report might deviate from the word limit.

30% -- 39%: There should be some work towards understanding and evaluation of the problem area, but significant issues are likely to be neglected. There may be significant errors or misconceptions in the report. There will be little evidence of any research. The report will likely be largely based on opinion without justification from literature or data. English may be poor, organisation poor, and parts of questions missed.

15% -- 29%: The project may contain some correct and relevant material, but most issues are neglected or are covered incorrectly. There should be some signs of appreciation of the report requirements. Some sections may not be covered at all. May look incomplete. Very little understanding shown, little evidence of engagement with the course.

0% -- 14%: Very little or nothing that is correct and relevant and there is no real appreciation of the report requirements. Report may be incomplete. Will give the impression that the student has not engaged with the course at all on any level.