Marking Guidelines

UNIVERSITÄT ROSTOCK

Prof. Olaf Wolkenhauer

Faculty for Computer Science & Electrical Engineering,
www.sbi.uni-rostock.de

Disclaimer

The following notes are only for guidance in preparation of any written material or oral presentation, for examinations and coursework the official "Prüfungsordnung" is applicable and legally binding.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING WRITTEN MATERIAL

An assessment of written work and on the basis of a report alone is done by considering the following aspects:

1. Preliminary Studies: background understanding, literature search, exploratory work.

2. Technical Achievement: difficulty of the project, embracing new ideas, originality, integrity of work, meeting the aims, practical considerations.

3. Analysis of Results, Conclusions: appropriate and thorough methods, clarity and accuracy of analysis, adequate acknowledgement of sources.

4. Organization of Report: abstract, clearly expressed aim, objectives and motivation, appropriate partitioning and structure of the document, references & citations.

5. Clarity of Text and Language: grammar, spelling, casual mistakes, clarity of expression in linguistic structures, ease of understanding.

6. Diagrams and Tables: legibility, clarity of caption texts, visual clarity of information in figures, labeling, numbering, references in text.

All aspects are weighted equally, except technical achievements which are weighted twice as much as any other category.

- **100%** would correspond to work, in that aspect, that reaches the highest standards that could be expected of a professional scientist with experience. Contains all of the relevant information with no errors or only insignificant errors. Displays excellent understanding of the subject within a wider context. Gives extensive evidence of critical awareness and independent thinking.

- **80%** corresponds to work that is, in that aspect, mainly of professional standard, but has few shortfalls. Displays good understanding of the subject within a wider context. Has reached beyond the essential material.

- **60%** corresponds to work which has, in that aspect, both strong and weak features with the stronger features being in the majority. Less evidence for critical awareness and independent thinking.

- **40%** corresponds to work that is marginally satisfactory in that aspect. There are several failings, but there are also some achievements and positive features. Little evidence of critical awareness and independent thinking. Lack of evidence for a deeper understanding of the subject within a wider context.

A report should be roughly structured as follows:

Introductory Part:
- State the question you wish to address.
- Describe how this question arises from its context.
- State how you are going to focus on the subject.
- State the objectives and the approach taken.
- Outline the report.

Literature Review:
- This should reflect the introductory part with more factual details.
- You must take a critical approach of the literature available.
- Highlight achievements, progress, open problems and gaps in the literature.
- Consider a range of sources, journals, Internet pages, books and make use of online search tools such as the “web-of-science”.

Research Methodology:
- Argue a roadmap for the project, decide upon the approach taken and the methodologies employed.
- Justify the approach by relating to the literature.

Results and Discussion:
- State what you have found.
- Determine the reliability of the conclusions made.
- How do your results compare to the literature, mention assumptions and provide an honest answer to possible weaknesses.
- Have you uncovered any surprises, did problems emerge, do the results confirm a hypothesis or known knowledge?
- State clearly the disadvantages and weaknesses of your approach/results in comparison to other works.

Conclusions:
- What can be concluded from your results?
- Given the opportunity, what could/should be done differently?
- State open problems, make recommendations for future directions of the work.

This structure can only serve as a guide and one should consult successful previous reports from the Department to learn. There is also specialised literature available on technical/scientific writing.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING ORAL PRESENTATIONS

Criteria:

- Structure of presentation: Overview, Introduction, Main Results, Discussion, Conclusions.
- Guidance of the audience throughout the presentation.
- Time keeping.
- Speed of delivery.
- Clarity of expression.
- Eye contact with the audience.
- Interaction with the audience.
- Response to questions.
- Clarity of slides.
- Readability of diagrams, equations, tables and figures; their explanation.

The following marking scheme indicates how marks may be distributed:

Mark	Percent	Criteria
1	90-100	**Outstanding,** comprehensive, factually faultless answer, evidence of originality and extensive knowledge.
1.3	80-89	**Very good**, factually faultless answer, good evidence of supplementary reading.
1.7	70-79	**Good**, logical presentation, evidence of supplementary reading, good coverage.
2.0-2.3-2.7	60-69	**Comprehensive**, clear, thorough answers, evidence of comprehensive coverage of material.
3.0-3.3-3.7	50-59	**Adequate** answer, perhaps some errors or key facts missing, expression moderate.
4.0	40-49	**Incomplete** response, sparse information, some inaccuracies, poor coverage of lecture material, no sign of comprehensive preparation, difficulties in expressing knowledge.
failed	30-39	**Deficient** response, many omissions or errors, expression and argument poor**.**
failed	15-29	**Poor** response, largely irrelevant to the question, little or no substance/factual material**,** apparent lack of preparation.
failed	0-14	**Inadequate** answer, obvious lack of preparation, little or no relevance to question, wrong approach and answers.