

Student:

ID:

Intake:

Question No:

TOTAL MARK: _____

Assessor:

Similarity Score: _____

Signature: _____

	20 marks	15 marks	10 marks	5 marks	0 marks
Relevance and clarity of research topic and questions	Topic is highly relevant, original, clearly defined. Questions are precise, focused, logically derived.	Topic is relevant and clearly stated. Questions are mostly clear and appropriate, minor focus issues.	Topic partially clear and somewhat relevant. Questions are loosely aligned or lack focus.	Topic unclear or somewhat irrelevant. Questions vague, broad, or poorly aligned.	Topic is irrelevant or missing. Questions are absent or incoherent.
Understanding of literature and theoretical context	Excellent understanding and critical synthesis of key literature and theory.	Good understanding of relevant literature with some critical engagement. Minor gaps in depth.	Some understanding of key literature; limited critical analysis or synthesis.	Basic engagement with literature; largely descriptive with minimal critical analysis.	Minimal or inappropriate use of literature; no evidence of theoretical understanding.
	30 marks	22 marks	15 marks	7 marks	0 marks
Justification and explanation of methodology	Methodology fully explained, well-justified, rigorously aligned with research questions. Methods and analysis are appropriate.	Methodology explained and justified, mostly aligned with research questions. Minor weaknesses in depth or alignment.	Methodology described with weak or partial justification; alignment is incomplete.	Methodology poorly described; justification minimal, limited appropriateness.	Methodology absent, inappropriate, or not justified.
	15 marks	12 marks	8 marks	4 marks	0 marks
Consideration of ethics, feasibility, and limitations	Ethical issues, feasibility, and limitations comprehensively addressed with mitigation strategies.	Ethical, feasibility, and limitation issues addressed reasonably; minor gaps.	Some recognition of ethics, feasibility, or limitations; discussion superficial.	Ethical, feasibility, or limitation considerations minimally addressed.	No consideration of ethics, feasibility, or limitations.
Academic writing, structure, and Harvard referencing	Writing clear, coherent, well-structured. Academic tone consistent. Harvard referencing accurate throughout.	Writing mostly clear and structured; minor errors in tone or referencing.	Writing understandable but basic; structure inconsistent; referencing partially correct.	Writing unclear or poorly structured; frequent errors; referencing mostly incorrect.	Writing very poor or incoherent; structure absent; referencing missing or incorrect.

Assessor's Comments

--