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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Number*:</th>
<th>___________________________</th>
<th>Student Surname*:</th>
<th>___________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor*:</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td>External Supervisor (if applicable)*: ______________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( Student to fill out this information at the time of submission)

**Please circle your decisions, and write an overall mark in the box.**

1. Knowledge displayed: Bottom10% Adequate Average Better Top10%
2. Demonstrated achievements of the project: Bottom10% Adequate Average Better Top10%
3. Suitable structure for the treatise: Bottom10% Adequate Average Better Top10%
4. Quality of the introduction: Bottom10% Adequate Average Better Top10%
5. Overall production quality: Bottom10% Adequate Average Better Top10%
6. Adequate references in the treatise: Bottom10% Adequate Average Better Top10%

**MARKING SCHEME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bottom10%</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Better</th>
<th>Top10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bottom 10% of the class (ie. a mark of roughly 0 – 40%)</td>
<td>just good enough to pass (50 – 60%)</td>
<td>an average student, possibly worthy of a Credit (60 – 70% ie. most students)</td>
<td>better than the average student, possibly worthy of a distinction (70 – 80%)</td>
<td>top 10% of the class (85% and over)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Mark for the Written Treatise (out of 100):** [ ]

**Project Management Mark (out of 100):** [ ]

**Has the external supervisor:** [ ]  * if applicable

**Seen the treatise?** [ ]  **Discussed the marks?** [ ]

**Please write your comments here:** (On request, this sheet will be shown to the student. It is important that the mark be justified with appropriate comments, as well as giving feedback)

___

(use the back of this sheet if you need more space)

**SUPERVISOR’s SIGNATURE:** ___________________________

* 2nd marker to be allocated by Project Coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd MARKER (if required):</th>
<th>___________________________</th>
<th>Treatise Mark from Second Marker</th>
<th>[ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd MARKER’S SIGNATURE:</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Please return this form to the General Office ***
Treatise Grade Descriptors

Excellent – (High Distinction 85 to 100)
Work of exceptional standard. Work demonstrates initiative and ingenuity in research, pointed and critical analysis of material, thoroughness of design, and innovative interpretation of evidence. Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the material and its relevance in a wider context. Demonstrates extensive knowledge and excellent conceptual understanding with well-balanced independent evaluation of the evidence and the opinions of others; original and imaginative treatment with evidence of insight and scholarship; confident and appropriate use of research tools. In particular, a HD treatise will have strengths in the following areas: outstanding command of expression and logical argument in a skilfully-structured manuscript, superior evaluation and integration of existing literature, evidence of significant insight and original thought in dealing with the critical issues, sophisticated understanding of research or design methods, with evidence of careful attention to critical design issues in the execution of the project, thoughtful and appropriate choice of data analysis/design methods and outstanding presentation and reporting of results, clear and coherent interpretation of the treatise data, and/or the results of other studies, and comprehensive understanding of the importance of the results in the context of the theoretical framework.

Very Good – (Distinction 75 to 84)
Work of superior standard. Work demonstrates initiative in research and reading, complex understanding and original analysis of subject matter and its context, both empirical and theoretical; shows critical understanding of the principles and values underlying the treatise topic. Comprehensive knowledge of the subject with evidence of independent thinking; appropriate assessment of the evidence used; critical approach to the opinions of others; logical and focused argument. In particular, a D treatise will have strengths in the following areas: the manuscript is well written, logically argued and generally well structured, the evaluation and integration of the existing literature is very sound without being outstanding, reasonable insight and some evidence of original thought in dealing with the critical issues, evidence of a solid understanding of research methods, adequate design of the research project, although possibly containing minor but retrievable errors, choice of data analysis that is appropriate for the design (although less well justified than might be expected of HD standard), and clear presentation of results, and generally sound but pedestrian interpretation of results and their importance to the theoretical context.

Good – (Credit 65 to 74)
Competent work. Evidence of extensive reading and initiative in research, sound grasp of subject matter and appreciation of key issues and context. Engages critically and creatively with the topic and attempts an analytical evaluation of material. Goes beyond a simple presentation of the topic to seeing how material in the literature relates to each other and to the problem at hand. In particular, a C thesis will have strengths in the following areas: generally competently written, although some problems exist in the logical organisation of the text and the way it is expressed, provides an adequate coverage of the literature, although it tends to be more descriptive than evaluative, and arguments are often disjointed, occasional evidence of insight into the issues underlying the topic, but little evidence of original thinking, basic but somewhat limited understanding of the research or design methods, the design of the research project is generally adequate but is marred by errors and oversights, serviceable choice of data analysis, although other approaches may have been more appropriate, the presentation of results lacks clarity, and interpretation of results or other studies is adequate but limited.

Average (Pass 50 to 64)
Work of acceptable standard. Work meets basic requirements in terms of reading and research and demonstrates a reasonable understanding of subject matter. Some knowledge of the subject but little evidence of independent thinking; unimaginative use of evidence and some useful sources not utilised; some attempt at a logical and focused argument; largely reliant upon secondary material; a very modest contribution to learning. In particular, a P thesis will be characterized by the following: the work is not well written and shows flaws in the structuring of logical arguments, coverage of the necessary literature is weak, with insufficient information provided to support the arguments made, or conclusions drawn, within the treatise, little evidence of insight and ideas tend to be highly derivative, knowledge of research or design methods is deficient, serious flaws exist in the design of the research project making it difficult for the research/design to meet its aims, data analysis techniques are arbitrary or inappropriate, the results are poorly presented, interpretations are superficial, demonstrating a weak understanding of the results and their relevance to the theoretical framework.

Poor – (Fail 0 to 49)
Work not of acceptable standard. Work may fail for any or all of the following reasons: unacceptable level of paraphrasing, irrelevance of content, presentation, grammar or structure so sloppy it cannot be understood, submitted very late without extension sought, not meeting the University’s values with regards to academic honesty, the work is very-poorly written and shows a serious inability to structure and present a logical argument, coverage of the necessary literature is inadequate, with little information provided relevant to the claims made, or conclusions drawn, within the treatise, serious misunderstanding of key concepts and issues, knowledge of research or design methods is lacking, serious flaws exist in the design of the research project, making it difficult or impossible for the research/design to meet its aims, data analysis techniques are inappropriate and the results are presented inadequately, an inability to show how the results of the research project relate to the theoretical framework; serious misinterpretations of results.
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