

SBUS 4999 Senior Year Project – **Written Report**

Student Name: _____ Student ID: _____

Supervisor: _____ Project Title: _____

	Outstanding	Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory	Mark Awarded
Mark for Criteria	5	4	3	2	<1	
Abstract 5%	Abstract easily understood by general university audience.	Description of research, context, approach and conclusion is clear.	Description of research/context and/or approach is ambiguous.	Abstract written in technical language/ jargon.	Abstract is incomplete/missing.	
Mark for Criteria	8-10	6.5 – 7.5	5 – 6.0	4 – 4.5	<4	
Research Question/Issue 10%	Research questions/issues were clearly identified. Objectives/ Hypotheses are clearly stated.	Research questions/issues were clearly identified. Objectives/ Hypotheses are given but some of which cannot be tested given the scope of senior year project.	Research questions/issues were somewhat defined/ were unrelated to the literature discussed.	Research questions/issues were unclearly defined and they were unrelated to the literature discussed.	Research question/issue was not defined/ summarised.	
Mark for Criteria	12 – 15	10 – 11.5	7.5 – 9.5	6–7	<6	
Literature Review 15%	Demonstrated a thorough discussion of literatures in the relevant areas. Clearly explained the relationship between the literature and the current project. Assumptions/ constraints (if relevant) were developed.	Most literature has been discussed with some important relevant studies missing. Generally able to relate the literature to the senior year project.	Relevant literature has been discussed but some important & relevant studies are missing. Attempted to explore theoretical relationship between literature and the current project, which needs further clarification.	Obvious materials/sources are missing. Have clearly NOT resorted to several sources of information.	Minimal sources and materials were cited.	

Mark for Criteria	12 – 15	10 – 11.5	7.5 – 9.5	6–7	<6	
<p>Methodology/ Approach Appropriate to Discipline</p> <p>15%</p>	<p>Methodology/ Approach is appropriate. Procedures of the discipline (e.g. experiment, survey, simulation model, interview, theoretical /conceptual model, etc.) are presented clearly.</p>	<p>Methodology/ Approach is appropriate. Procedures of the discipline (e.g. experiment, survey, simulation model, interview, theoretical /conceptual model, etc.) are given with a few errors.</p>	<p>Methodology/Approach is partially appropriate with flaws. Procedures of the discipline are briefly described in the sense that the findings/ models generated cannot be evaluated.</p>	<p>Methodology/Approach is contentious/questionable. Procedures of the discipline are described in the sense that the study cannot be replicated.</p>	<p>Methodology/Approach was vaguely described or missing.</p>	
Mark for Criteria	16 – 20	13 – 15.5	10 – 12.5	8 – 9.5	<8	
<p>Findings/ Supporting Evidence</p> <p>20%</p>	<p>Findings/ evidence reported help answer the research questions stated. Evidence is sufficient and well-utilised. Accuracy and relevance of evidence are appropriately questioned. Appropriate quantitative (e.g. statistical analyses, simulation, etc.) / qualitative tools (e.g. systematic interview, consideration of structural variables in conceptual models, etc.) are utilised. Able to evaluate, analyse and synthesise information.</p>	<p>Findings/ evidence reported is related to the research questions. Evidence is sufficient. Appropriate quantitative (e.g. statistical analyses, simulation, etc.) / qualitative tools (e.g. systematic interview, consideration of structural variables in conceptual models, etc.) are utilised. Able to evaluate and analyse information.</p>	<p>Findings address part of the research questions. Quantitative/ qualitative tools are used, but some tools are not incorrectly used or some findings are flawed/ confounded/ are the result of over-claim. There are mistakes with data/information evaluation and analyses.</p>	<p>Only some descriptive findings were shown. Assertions of qualitative/ quantitative results are unwarranted.</p>	<p>No findings were discussed/ Conceptual model was incomplete.</p> <p>Evaluation, analysis and synthesis of information are highly limited.</p>	

	Outstanding	Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory	Mark Awarded
Mark for Criteria	12 – 15	10 – 11.5	7.5 – 9.5	6–7	<6	
Conclusions/ Implications Limitations & Future Studies 15%	Able to make significance of what was discovered or created. Limitations were clearly defined. Able to develop areas for which future research explores.	Able to make significance of what was discovered or created. Limitations were discussed. Able to develop areas for which future research explores.	Able to draw on some significance of what was discovered or created. Limitations/ future studies are not clearly specified/ irrelevant.	Conclusions/ Implications are unclear.	Conclusions/ Implications are missing. Failed to describe the limitations of study and did not explore avenues for future studies.	
Mark for Criteria	8-10	6.5 – 7.5	5 – 6.0	4 – 4.5	<4	
Structure and Coherence 10%	The organisation of report is well-structured. Very good use of sub-headings/ signpost to help readers' understanding.	The overall structure is reasonably good. Shows evidence of using sub-headings/ signpost to help the readers' understanding.	The report is structured but there are clear leaps among sections. Sub-headings/ signposts were not properly used.	The report is unstructured and is merely coherent. Sub-headings/ signposts were seldom used.	The report is unstructured and it lacks coherence.	
Mark for Criteria	8-10	6.5 – 7.5	5 – 6.0	4 – 4.5	<4	
Writing 10%	Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas. Errors are highly minimal. Referencing styles (e.g. APA) were properly used. ±5% deviation from the word limit specified.	Language generally communicates ideas but there are a few places where ideas were ambiguous. Referencing styles were used but some citation errors. ±10% deviation from the word limit specified.	Language communicates some ideas but grammatical/ spelling mistakes are distracting. Referencing styles were used with many citation errors. ±15% deviation from the word limit specified.	Language rarely communicates ideas/ obscures meaning. Grammatical/spelling mistakes are distracting or repeated. Referencing styles are inconsistent. ±20% deviation from the word limit specified.	Language fails to communicate ideas and obscures meaning. Grammatical/spelling mistakes are distracting or repeated. No referencing. Did not follow the word limit guidance.	
Total Mark						

Second marker name	
Second marker decision	<input type="checkbox"/> Endorse the mark awarded by supervisor
	<input type="checkbox"/> Not endorse the mark awarded by supervisor. Please provide further information for not endorse:
Second marker signature	
Supervisor signature	
Date	