

Group Project Marking Criteria

Not exhaustive and judge each sub-allocation as a whole given the sub-criteria and other thoughts...e.g. if a otherwise perfect map (e.g. colour, scale bar...) but its so overcrowded it cannot be interpreted then it can be marked as a D/E)

25% marks allocated to maps based on:

- Appropriate type of map for the data
- Appropriate colours/symbology scheme
- Appropriate inclusion of data (e.g. not overcrowded)
- Appropriate inclusion of north arrow, scale bar, legend, title
- Appropriate inclusion of an inset map (or alternative) in at-least one map

25% allocated to the methods used based on:

- Quality (difficulty) of spatial methods used
- Quantity of spatial methods used
 - Give some credit even if not fully cohesive, mark down for this in methods/data
 - Give some credit even if they do not fully outline what they did if you can confidently work out what they did
- To some degree, on other methods (e.g. quantitative) used and be lenient if there are flaws (this is not a quantitative methods assessment)

20% allocated to write up of introduction, literature review, research question/objectives based on:

- They explain the literature/backdrop for their study to a level a layman (in many cases we will be that layman) can understand
- Sufficient references (e.g. ~10) to support they read the literature
 - We are not expected to know the literature but you can reasonably judge and penalize if you believe they are out-of-date (e.g. if about bicycle parking then if all studies are before 2000 the student is likely not up-to-date)
- Pose clear research question
- The research question is supported in terms of previous studies; and
- Supported in terms of its relevance/importance

10% allocated to write up of data/methods based on:

- Appropriately explain data used, the source, if relevant, how missing data is treated
- Quality of write up (penalize if they explain every generic ArcGIS operation, e.g. "I used 'select by attribute' to..." rather than "I filtered data based on...")

- Appropriately explain the methods used (you can penalize if they choose the wrong/not appropriate method and don't argue why it could be OK to use)

20% allocated to write up of results, discussion and conclusion based on:

- Appropriate write-up of their results (you can penalize if not coherent)
- Appropriate inclusion of maps (but do not mark the maps themselves)
- Discussion of the limitations of their analysis (though you can allocate some marks if they have instead done this in their data/methods section)
 - Particularly around the data used i.e., error and uncertainty
 - But also, the methods used
- Appropriate conclusion (not necessarily has to be separate from discussion) which
 - Draws on the wider literature they explained earlier; and
 - Their objectives/research question set out