

# UG Marking Guidelines - Mini Projects Video (Y2)

## Video

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| 1<br>st      | Creative and very engaging video; informative, highly structured with a clear outline of the project, taking into account the audience  |
| 2<br>:<br>1  | Mostly creative and engaging video; informative, well-structured but perhaps some issues with clarity in places, shows evidence of taking into account the audience   |
| 2<br>:<br>2  | Creative and engaging video to some extent; recognizable structure but coupled with some obvious shortcomings (e.g., inappropriate content – too long/simple/complex), some evidence of consideration of the lay-audience |
| 3<br>rd      | Unengaging video with little creativity and structure, messy video with very little (if any) consideration of lay-audience  |
| F<br>a<br>il | Video is completely unengaging and uncreative, is devoid of structure and does not make use of appropriate visual/auditory resources, no consideration of lay-audience  |

-

## Group responses to questions

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| 1<br>st      | Questions answered thoughtfully and clearly taking into account the information in the video and the type of audience                                    |
| 2<br>:<br>1  | Questions answered thoughtfully and clearly for the most part with some consideration of the information in the video and of the type of audience        |
| 2<br>:<br>2  | Questions may not have been properly understood or answered appropriately, not taking into account the information in the video and the type of audience |
| 3<br>rd      | Questions answered poorly or not attempted.  |
| F<br>a<br>il | No questions answered.   |

-

## Project design / analysis

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| 1<br>st      | The study was designed thoughtfully to allow the group to investigate the research question rigorously and all obvious confounds had been removed (e.g. order effects). Appropriate analyses were used (e.g. testing between variables) and are explained and presented very clearly |
| 2<br>:<br>1  | The study design answers the research question well and most obvious confounds had been removed. Appropriate analyses were used (e.g. testing between variables) and are explained and presented clearly on the whole  |
| 2<br>:<br>2  | The study design allows some aspect of the research question to be answered, although there may be some obvious confounds that were not controlled. Some attempt at appropriate analyses (e.g. testing between variables) but they are not explained and presented clearly           |
| 3<br>rd      | The study design does not really allow the research question to be addressed. Inappropriate analyses were used (e.g. testing between when design is within) and are not explained or presented clearly   |
| F<br>a<br>il | The study design does not allow the research question to be addressed. No analyses reported  |

**Understanding of project (from video and answers to questions)**

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| 1<br>st      | Excellent understanding of the topic area. Well researched and excellent grasp of relevant previous research. Excellent understanding of what the results mean and how they relate back to the research question. Insightful suggestions for improvements and future research. |
| 2<br>:<br>1  | Solid understanding of the topic area. Good understanding of some key previous research. Good understanding of what the results mean. Some good suggestions for improvements and future research.  |
| 2<br>:<br>2  | Good understanding of the core topic area. Limited research: some understanding of key previous research but some omissions. There may be some confusion as to what the results mean. Suggestions for improvements and future research may be limited in scope.                |
| 3<br>rd      | Poor understanding of the topic area. No knowledge of key previous research. Lack of understanding over what the results mean. Suggestions for improvements and future research may be missing   |
| F<br>a<br>il | No evidence of understanding the topic area or any relevant previous research. No understanding of what the results mean and no suggestions for improvements and future research.  |

The overall mark will reflect your group's performance in all four sections and will therefore be a mean of your grades in the four sections.

**Notes to faculty:**

1. The allocation of the 3 possible marks within a grade boundary (e.g. 62,65,68 in 2:1) should reflect how well the group performed within each degree class boundary (e.g. a group with mainly 2:1 attributes but the odd 1<sup>st</sup> attribute should get a 68; a group with mainly 2:1 attributes but the odd 2:2 attribute should get a 62).