



L-Università ta' Malta  
Institute of Earth Systems

---

# **EMP 3025: PROJECT Guidance Handbook**

---

**B.Sc. (Hons) in Earth Systems**

February 2024

# Contents

<b>1. The project and its management</b>	
What is the project?	3
<hr/>	
<b>2. Project types</b>	
Research-oriented project	4
Practice-oriented project	5
<hr/>	
<b>3. Supervision</b>	
What does supervision entail?	7
Who will supervise my work?	8
<hr/>	
<b>4. Written deliverables</b>	
1. The concept note	9
2. The written proposal	9
3. The final report	10
Plagiarism and use of Artificial Intelligence	13
<hr/>	
<b>5. Oral presentations</b>	
1. Proposal presentation	14
2. Final presentation	14
<hr/>	
<b>6. Ethics review</b>	16
<hr/>	
<b>7. Timeline</b>	18
<hr/>	
<b>8. Assessment rubric</b>	19
<hr/>	
<b>Annex 1: Record of supervisory meetings</b>	22
<b>Annex 2: Proposal form</b>	22

# 1. The project and its management

## What is the project?

The project is a substantial research-oriented or practice-oriented exercise that is completed by individual students on a subject of their choice, under the guidance of an assigned supervisor. The project is expected to demonstrate students' understanding of the research process and their ability to apply the knowledge and skills acquired throughout the course to a practical problem or research question.

Upon completion of your project, you will (i) submit a written report, and (ii) present your findings during an oral presentation session.

You will be expected to start developing your project ideas at the start of Semester 4. By the end of this semester, you will have:

- decided on the type of project you would like to do – the different types of project are explained below;
- decided on a topic for your project;
- been assigned a supervisor, with whom you will work to further develop your ideas;
- presented your idea to faculty and fellow students during a seminar; and
- submitted a formal written proposal for review by the Board of Studies (or a subcommittee thereof).

Work on the actual project will then take place over Semesters 5 and 6. For those who also wish to make use of the summer months in between Semesters 4 and 5, this is usually a good opportunity to make headway with your work. The project timeline is explained in further detail below.

---

## 2. Project types

The project can be either **research-oriented** or **practice-oriented**. Both types of project are equally valid, contribute substantially to your learning, and will be considered worthy by examiners. Both are expected to demonstrate rigour and a high standard of work, based on a good understanding of the research process. They differ only in the nature of the outputs expected.

### Research-oriented project

As per the **University of Malta's Research Code of Practice**, research involves “*systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, **designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge***” [own emphasis].

The key here is the *intent to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge*. This means that your work is intended to produce results (which can be theories, methods, or conclusions) that can be extended beyond a single case study or individual. Generalizable knowledge may involve developing, testing or supporting theories, principles, designs, or statements of relationships, or may contribute knowledge on the feasibility or effectiveness of an approach or analysis framework. Research is also systematic, i.e., involving a methodical procedure of developing and articulating a research question, critically evaluating relevant literature, providing a detailed description of data collection and analysis methods, and deriving conclusions based on the results obtained.

Examples of possible student research-oriented projects include the following:

- Determining whether there is a relationship between soil salinity and sodicity in calcareous soils.
- Testing whether a methodology for measuring the urban heat island effect developed in the US can be applied in Malta or other small island contexts.
- Examining the degree of agreement between climate models for the Mediterranean region.
- Developing or refining a method applied to selected sites for ecological restoration.
- Examining the feasibility of using microfossils to understand environmental change.
- Analysing correlations between different measurement scales for determining people's connectedness to nature.

In all these examples, the results of the project should contribute knowledge that will be of *general* interest to other researchers, regardless of whether they are familiar with Malta. In quantitative work, there is also often an expectation that the generalizability of findings is evaluated through appropriate methods of statistical analysis.

Research is not considered generalizable if you are simply analysing an issue or phenomenon in Malta because no one else has yet done so, without explicit consideration of (i) why it is useful to study the issue or phenomenon in Malta, and (ii) why and how your findings are relevant to researchers outside Malta.

## Practice-oriented project

A practice-oriented project addresses a 'real world' gap or problem that is of relevance to society and that is relevant to professional practice in environmental sciences and management. As an end result, the project will generate outputs that are usable or actionable. These outputs need not be generalizable but are expected to be directly relevant and applicable to the problem being considered. Examples of such projects include:

- Designing an effective campaign to raise awareness of an environmental issue.
- Creating a documentary about a valuable under-documented feature or site.
- Developing a visitor guide for a protected area.
- Auditing water or energy use in a facility.
- Evaluating the preparedness of a hotel for eco-certification.
- Developing a biodiversity-friendly landscaping plan for a public outdoor space.
- Evaluating the effectiveness of a specific plan or policy.

In such a project, you are producing a deliverable that will be of immediate relevance, in most cases to a client or target organisation, or in some cases to society in general.

Although the focus here is on practical relevance, you are still expected to adopt a systematic approach to your work, similar to that used in research projects. This means that you need to identify and characterise the problem or gap you are addressing, and engage critically with academic literature, both to contextualise your project and to identify a suitable design/methodology. For example, if your project involves designing a campaign, you would need to first carefully review the literature to see what features characterise successful/unsuccessful campaigns, whether there are relevant differences between different communication media, what criteria can be used to determine effectiveness, whether there are design considerations that are specific to different audiences, etc. You would also need to determine the steps needed for you to execute your project in a manner that reflects best practices in the field. Similarly, if you are conducting an energy audit, you would first need to critically review and evaluate different methodologies to enable you to then make an informed decision about the methodology you yourself will use in the study.

The nature of the literature review that you undertake will depend on the specific target of your project, but in all cases, it is expected that your work is informed by the relevant academic literature.

---

### In common:

Both **research-based** and **practice-based** projects are expected to:

- be based on a well-defined problem, need or research question;
- be critically informed by relevant literature;
- be implemented through a systematic procedure that is clearly explained;
- be analytically robust; and
- generate findings that are clearly communicated.

**They differ in that:**

A **research project** has the intention of producing *generalizable knowledge* that will be of academic interest to researchers in the field of study, while a **practice-oriented project** generates *outputs that address an immediate need or gap and that are usable or actionable*, often by a target organisation or client.

---

### 3. Supervision

#### What does supervision entail?

The role of the supervisor is that of guidance. S/he will work with you to help you refine your topic and define a project that will be manageable within the time available. Supervisors will give you feedback at various stages on your planning, on the methodology you plan to implement, on data collection and analysis, and on your writing.

However, they are **not** responsible for ensuring timely and successful completion of your project. Adequate time management remains entirely the responsibility of the student. It is also the responsibility of students to act on feedback provided to improve their work. Supervisors are furthermore not responsible for correcting language errors in your written draft or for editing, formatting or proofreading this in any way. They may point out that your writing needs improvement, but it is then up to you to make the necessary changes.

The above points and other relevant details concerning supervision can be found within the **Institute of Earth Systems' Supervision Guidelines**.

Supervisors are expected to:

- (i) Meet with you for a total of **approximately 5 hours** over the course of the project. While the scheduling of such tutorials is entirely at the discretion of your supervisor, meetings can normally be expected to be held as follows:
  - After you have identified a general topic of interest and before you submit your proposal, to help you shape and refine your ideas.
  - After your proposal has been submitted and approved, to plan out the initial phases of work.
  - To discuss methods for data collection/project execution.
  - To review and discuss the results/outputs obtained.
  - To help you prepare for the presentation of your results.

If the nature of the project you are proposing is such that you would require significant additional support from your supervisor, you should seriously consider an alternative topic.

Note that you should keep a record of all supervisory meetings held, using the online **Record of Supervisory Meetings form**, a copy of which is provided in Annex 1. This form should be completed at the end of each meeting and signed by both student and supervisor. A copy should be retained by both.

- (ii) Review your written/presentation work as follows (each of these deliverables is explained in further detail in section 4 below):
  - One version of your proposal, before this is submitted to the Board of Studies.
  - One version of your presentation for the proposal seminar.

- One version of each section of your written report.
- One version of your full report before submission.
- One version of your final oral presentation.

Supervisors are allowed a period of **4 working weeks** (excluding recess/holiday periods) from when you submit a deliverable in which to provide their feedback. This means that if you fall behind schedule and do not leave adequate time for review, your work may not be reviewed in its entirety.

If the quality of the work submitted is poor, supervisors may feel it necessary to review a second version of your work. In such cases, however, the final mark given by your supervisor is required to reflect the need for additional review and corrections.

Do bear in mind that supervisors have various other commitments and may be unavailable for blocks of time (for example, because of travel commitments). You are therefore strongly advised to work with your supervisor at the start of the project to determine a mutually-convenient timetable for both meetings and submission of written deliverables.

### Who will supervise my work?

Each project will be guided by **one** supervisor. Supervisors are usually:

- Institute of Earth Systems (IES) resident academics, or
- Resident academics from other faculties or institutes closely associated with the IES and who possess relevant complementary expertise.

The decision of who will supervise your work will be made by the B.Sc. (Hons) Earth Systems Board of Studies (or subcommittee thereof), on the basis of the topic that you choose to work on. You will find out more about the research areas of IES academics during a seminar which will be held early in semester 4.

When assigning supervisors to students, the IES takes into account the range and nature of topics being proposed and also the other teaching, supervisory and administrative commitments of academics during the academic year in question.

The allocation of supervisors is **final and non-negotiable**, unless there are valid and compelling reasons why you are unable or unwilling to work under the guidance of the supervisor you have been assigned. In such cases, you will need to make a formal request to the Board of Studies for a change in supervision, with an accompanying justification. A similar request can be made in the unlikely event that you encounter problems while working with your supervisor during the course of the project.

While you are free to informally discuss your project ideas with any IES resident academics, **you should not approach any non-IES academics with requests for supervision, unless specifically instructed to do so.**

---



## 4. Written deliverables

### 1. The concept note

You will first be asked to submit a concept note, due by end February 2024. This is a short (1 paragraph) summary of your project ideas. You are asked to submit short explanations of **3 possible projects** that you are considering (i.e. 3 paragraphs in total). This will allow faculty to consider the feasibility of different options, in case your first choice cannot be accommodated. For each of your ideas, please indicate whether you are considering a **research-oriented** or a **practice-oriented** project.

### 2. The written proposal

By the end of Semester 4, you will submit a formal written proposal for consideration by the Board of Studies. The written proposal is a 4-to-6 page description of your proposed project. It should include the following elements; please note that the lengths indicated are approximate guides:

- **Introduction:** 1 to 2 paragraphs introducing the subject of your project, its significance and what it aims to achieve. Make sure that the research statement/project goal is clear. This should be written in 1 to 2 sentences, in a format similar to the following:  
*"The aim of this project is to.../This project seeks to answer the following question..."*
- **Background literature review:** A 1-page discussion and synthesis of literature relevant to your project; this should provide context for your proposed work and should help situate your project within the context of existing professional work or research in the subject area.
- **Scope of work, tasks and methods:** This should include:
  - 1 paragraph explaining the scope of work (broadly, what you will be doing).
  - 1 to 2 paragraphs explaining the stages of the study.
  - 1 to 2 paragraphs explaining the information or data that you expect to gather and the methods that you expect to be using to gather such data.
  - 1 to 2 paragraphs explaining the methods that you will use to analyse your information/data.
- **Key results and outputs:** 1 to 2 paragraphs explaining the main outputs that you expect your project to produce and why these will be useful.
- **Project timeline:** A project management timeline, in which you indicate what work you will be doing on a week-by-week basis, from proposal approval through to project submission. Various project management templates are available online and can be downloaded free of charge. You may wish to use a Gantt chart to help you draft your timeline.
- **Reference list:** This should list works that have been cited in the proposal.

Your proposal submission should be accompanied by the proposal form included in Annex II, an editable version of which is available on the IES website.

### 3. The final report

#### Length

The written report is submitted on completion of your project. It should be approximately 8,000 words in length (with an allowance of +/- 5%). This word limit includes titles and subtitles, table and figure captions, and in-text citations, but excludes the reference list and any appendices. Reports that exceed this length may be penalised.

Note that the ability to communicate concisely is a key skill in academia. Most journals set a strictly-imposed word limit of around 6,000-7,000 words, because scientists are expected to be able to communicate their research effectively without excessive length. The word length that has been set for this report (8,000 words) is intended to help you develop the skill of writing concisely. This word length will also help should you decide to submit your work for eventual publication.

In exceptional cases, it may be necessary for the word limit to be extended because the nature of the project requires more detailed explanation than can be provided in 8,000 words. In such cases, a request for an increase in word length can be submitted to the Board of Studies for its consideration. Note that cases in which an increase in word length is truly merited are rare, and such requests should only be made under the guidance of your supervisor and if a strong justification can be provided. A dedicated form for such requests is available [for download](#) on the IES website.

#### Content and structure

All reports should include the following, in sequence:

- Title page
- Dedication (optional)
- Declaration of authenticity/abidance by research code of practice and ethics review procedures (available [online](#))
- A 250-300 word abstract of your work
- Acknowledgments
- Table of contents
- List of tables (if applicable)
- List of figures (if applicable)
- Main body of your report
- Reference list
- Appendices (if applicable)

Depending on the nature and topic of your project, the main body of your report will generally include the following elements:

- **Introduction**, in which you set the scene, outline the problem you are addressing, and explain the aims, scope, and significance of your work.
- **Literature review**, in which you contextualise your work with reference to other research/professional work.
- **Methodology**, in which you explain your research design/project execution, methods of data collection and analysis (if applicable), as well as any significant limitations; relevant ethical considerations should also be discussed here.
- **Results/findings**, in which you present the main outputs obtained.
- **Analysis/discussion**, in which you analyse and interpret your results/findings.
- **Conclusions**, in which you briefly revisit your aims and whether these were achieved, discuss the broad insights and implications of your work, and present recommendations for future work or further research, as relevant.
- **Reference list**

Although all of the above should be present in any report, it may be appropriate for some of these elements to be combined. For example, it is common to have a combined *Results, Analysis and Discussion* section, or alternatively a *Results and Analysis* section, with a separate *Discussion*. For some projects, the literature review may be integrated into the introduction, as is common in many journal papers. For specific guidance on how to structure your report, you are advised to consult with your supervisor.

### Formatting

**Paper:** International standard size A4 (29.7 cm x 21 cm).

**Margins:** Top, bottom and right-hand side margins should be at least 2.45 cm wide, while the left margin should be 4 cm wide (to allow for binding).

**Font:** Arial, size 12 pt.

**Spacing:** One and a half line spacing to be used for the main text.

**Layout of title page:** Title of project and subtitle (if any), followed by name of student, and the words “A report presented to the Institute of Earth Systems of the University of Malta for the degree of Bachelor of Science (Hons) in Earth Systems”, followed by month and year of submission.

**Acknowledgements:** In this section, you should express thanks to those who assisted you in your research (e.g. academic supervisors, family, etc.).

**References:** The **Harvard** system should be used throughout.

**Quotations:** All quotations must include author name, year of publication and page number (preceded by “p.”) referring to the parent text. Quotations of more than forty words should

be single-spaced and should form a distinct paragraph (indent by 0.5 cm and do NOT use quotation marks).

**Headings:**

Font size: 14

Bold typeface

Section title: Justified left.

All other headings: Justified left and followed by a single line space.

Sub-headings: Use a numbering system for sub-headings to give structure to your work.

**Tables, figures, etc.:** Must be numbered according to the section they are in (e.g. Tables 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 etc. in Section 1; Tables 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 etc. in Section 2).

**Paragraphs:** No indentation should be used; new paragraphs to be started after two returns.

**Spelling:** British English spelling is to be used throughout; the Oxford English Dictionary is recommended.

**Pagination:** Page numbers should be centred at the bottom of the page. Roman numerals (i, ii, iii, iv, etc.) should be used from the first page (excluding the title page) until the start of the main body of the text. The main text, including the introduction, references and any appendices of the dissertation, should be numbered using Arabic numerals (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.).

**Binding:** Three (3) spiral-bound copies of the report must be submitted to the Institute Office by the submission deadline. After successful completion of the examination process, candidates should hand in two (2) copies of the report, as approved by the Board of Examiners, which shall be bound as follows:

Hardbound with stiff boards (dark blue) and on good quality paper, with lettering (silver) on the front cover and spine showing:

- Name of student
- Project title
- The degree for which the report is being submitted
- The year of submission

Maps, diagrams, graphs, printed material, and so on, should be bound within the report. If this is not possible, they should be presented separately in special folders or volumes, which should be numbered and inserted in a sleeve attached to the inside of the cover. Any audio or video submissions should also be provided in this manner.

## Plagiarism and use of Artificial Intelligence

Note that both the proposal and final report are to be submitted via Turnitin and will be thoroughly checked for plagiarism. You are reminded that plagiarism is a serious offence; any cases of plagiarism detected will be referred for the necessary disciplinary action.

You will have the opportunity to check the Turnitin report for **draft** versions of your work, as follows:

- Proposal: a draft submission area is available on the VLE under EMP 2024.
- Final report: a draft submission area will be available under EMP 3025.

Please note also that any use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in your work needs to be duly acknowledged and explained. While you are free to make appropriate use of AI tools (e.g. to find literature), any use of AI to generate intellectual content that you are expected to create yourselves will be considered fraudulent and treated accordingly.

---

## 5. Oral presentations

You will be required to make two presentations of your work, as explained below.

### 1. Proposal presentation

A presentation of your **proposal** during a dedicated seminar: for academic year 2023/24, this is scheduled for 21 May 2024. The seminar will be attended by fellow students (possibly including students from other years of the course) and faculty members.

The presentation should be approximately **8 minutes** in length. In it, you should:

- Introduce the subject of your project and its relevance.
- Clearly articulate your aim/objectives.
- Explain the scope of work, tasks, and methods, i.e., what you will be doing, the proposed stages of the study, the information or data that you expect to gather and the methods you expect to use to do so, as well as methods that you expect to use to analyse your information/data.
- Explain the key results and outputs that you expect your work to produce.
- Outline any constraints/limitations that may affect your ability to complete the project or parts of it, and how you plan to overcome these.

Your presentation will be followed by a discussion, in which fellow students and staff will provide constructive feedback on your proposed project. This is a valuable opportunity for an objective check of what you propose to do and may serve to enhance your ideas as well as to alert you to potential difficulties. You will have the opportunity to take this feedback into account before submitting your final proposal for consideration by the Board of Studies.

### 2. Final presentation

Following submission of your final report, you will deliver a short presentation of your results at the end of Semester 6. This will be scheduled at any point up to the end of the semester; you are therefore strongly advised to refrain from taking on any commitments (notably, travel plans) that would limit your availability. It will not be possible to reschedule any assigned presentation date/time slots, except for exceptional and justifiable reasons.

The final presentation will be attended by a panel of examiners (which will include a chairperson, your supervisor, an internal examiner from the University of Malta, and an external examiner (an academic not from the University of Malta), and may also be open to other staff and students, at the discretion of the IES. In the case of practice-oriented projects that have been prepared with a specific organisation or client in mind, these may also be invited to attend.

The presentation should be approximately **12 minutes** in length. In it, you should:

- Introduce the subject of your project and its relevance.
- Clearly articulate your aim/objectives.

- Explain what you did and how, and any significant limitations.
- Explain the key results and outputs achieved, and discuss their significance.
- Highlight the main conclusions of your work and any key recommendations.

Your presentation will be followed by questions from the panel of examiners, and at the chairperson's discretion, from other members of the audience. Following this discussion, you (and any other audience members) will be asked to vacate the room, while the examiners discuss your submitted work and oral presentation. Afterwards, you will be called back in to be told whether your work was assigned a passing or failing grade. The actual mark awarded will then be published on conclusion of the presentation sessions for all students.

---

## 6. Ethics review

Researchers are expected to be conscious of any ethical implications of the work that they plan to carry out, and to ensure necessary safeguards. The University of Malta has dedicated **Research Ethics Review Procedures** for such review, that require researchers to **self-evaluate** their work using the **URECA form** available on the UM's University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) website. This self-evaluation process also applies to student projects and should be completed by **all** students, regardless of whether their research is research- or practice-oriented.

This self-evaluation process has two possible outcomes:

- 1) You answer YES to at least one question in Part 2 of the form; this means that your work could potentially have ethical implications and requires further review by the IES Research Ethics Committee (REC). This does not mean that you will not be able to carry out the work you planned. It simply means that you will need to provide further information for the REC to be able to evaluate the possible ethical implications of your work and to guide you accordingly. In this case, you must await feedback before collecting any data.
- 2) You answered NO to all questions in Part 2; it is therefore highly unlikely that your work raises ethical concerns. You should submit your form for filing and audit purposes but no further evaluation is required. You may therefore proceed with data collection.

The form itself will guide you as to which outcome applies in your case.

The self-evaluation process should be carried out under the guidance of your supervisor. You are also strongly advised to read through the UREC **Research Ethics FAQs** and to consult the other **online resources** before attempting to fill in the form.

The URECA form should be submitted **before starting data collection**, but only once you have a clear idea of your methodology and when you have finalised your data collection instruments and related documentation (e.g. surveys, interview questions, information letters, consent forms). Note that these will need to be uploaded when you submit your form.

Your completed self-assessment form should be submitted to the **IES Research Ethics Committee**. Your supervisor will be required to **endorse your submission** through the URECA system. It is only when your supervisor does this that your submission is considered complete.

Note that if you plan to ask the Office of the Registrar to share any materials on your behalf (e.g. sending out a survey to UM students), you **must tick yes in answer to question 17 (Cooperating Institutions)**.



Please be aware that failure to complete this self-assessment process before starting your project is considered a serious breach of discipline and would make you subject to disciplinary procedures by the University of Malta.

---

## 7. Timeline

<b>2024</b>	
Monday 26 February	Submission of concept note
27 February – 8 March	Individual advising Allocation of supervisor
Tuesday 21 May	Presentation of proposal at seminar
Thursday 6 June	Written proposal submission deadline
During June	Board of Studies review of submitted proposals
By 30 June	Communication of Board of Studies decision
<b>2025</b>	
Monday 7 April	Deadline for submitting any work to your supervisors for review
Friday 2 May	Deadline for supervisors to provide final feedback
Monday 19 May	Final written report submission deadline
Mid- to end-June	Presentation session

## 8. Assessment rubric

Your examiners will assign a grade to your work based on standard criteria that are used to ensure that different projects from different students are graded consistently. Each criterion has a range of marks that can be awarded, as shown below.

Criterion	Maximum possible mark
1. Understanding of subject matter	15
2. Project contextualisation	15
3. Methodological soundness	15
4. Analytical breadth and depth	20
5. Logic and soundness	15
6. Quality of writing	15
7. Quality of presentation	5

Each of these criteria is explained in further detail below.

Understanding of subject matter	Marks
A <b>deficient</b> understanding of the subject matter, with major gaps and/or errors in knowledge.	0-6
A <b>minimally acceptable</b> understanding of the subject matter, with major gaps and/or errors in knowledge.	7-9
An <b>acceptable</b> understanding of the subject matter, with some gaps and/or errors.	10-12
An <b>advanced</b> understanding of the subject matter, with few if any gaps and/or errors.	13-15
Project contextualisation	Marks
<b>No or very minimal</b> consideration of how the project builds on/contributes to previous work.	0-6
<b>Minimal</b> consideration of how the project builds on/contributes to previous work, with a general lack of critical evaluation of relevant literature and/or with major gaps in literature considered and/or misrepresentation of work.	7-9

An <b>acceptable</b> level of consideration of how the project builds on/contributes to previous work, with generally critical assessment and consideration of relevant literature, albeit with some limitations/gaps.	10-12
A <b>thorough</b> critical analysis of how the project builds on/contributes to previous work, with no major gaps/errors, nor any misrepresentation of work.	13-15
<b>Methodological soundness</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Significant flaws</b> in the methodology in either appropriateness to the problem context or in execution. As a consequence, the findings of this project are compromised or unable to address the aim. The student lacks awareness and/or understanding of the limitations of the study.	0-6
<b>Generally appropriate</b> methodology to the problem context, with some significant flaws in design or execution that do not, however, affect the credibility of the findings. The student shows some knowledge of limitations but does not appear to fully understand how these may have affected results obtained.	7-9
<b>Appropriate</b> methodology to the problem context, with minor flaws in design or execution. Student shows generally competent understanding of limitations and of how these can affect the results obtained.	10-12
<b>Excellent</b> methodological design and execution, with few or no flaws. The student shows a good critical understanding of the methodology used and its limitations.	13-15
<b>Analytical breadth and depth</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Largely descriptive</b> report, with <b>very little analytical problem characterisation</b> . Significant underdevelopment of analysis/discussion/conclusions.	0-8
Report is <b>largely descriptive</b> but with <b>some, limited evidence of problem characterisation</b> . However, the analysis has significant gaps. Some underdevelopment of analysis/discussion/conclusions.	9-12
<b>Largely analytical</b> with some gaps in comprehensiveness/thoroughness. Analysis/discussion/conclusions are generally adequate, though with some scope for further development.	13-16
<b>Thorough analytical</b> characterisation of problems and/or relationships, as relevant. There are no major gaps. Analysis, discussion and conclusions are well developed.	17-20

Logic and soundness	Marks
<b>Poor reasoning and logical connection</b> between points. Frequent failure to substantiate claims with appropriate evidence. General lack of structured and logical sequencing of material into a coherent whole.	0-6
<b>Generally coherent and logical flow and structure</b> , possibly with some flaws. However, several key points, claims and/or conclusions are not substantiated with appropriate evidence.	7-9
<b>Coherent and logical flow</b> , with only <b>minor flaws</b> in structure or sequence. Most key points/claims/conclusions are generally adequately substantiated with appropriate evidence.	10-12
<b>Coherent, logical flow throughout</b> , with no or very minor flaws in structure or sequence. Key points/claims/conclusions are almost always substantiated with appropriate evidence.	13-15
Quality of writing	Marks
<b>Unacceptable writing quality.</b> Numerous errors of syntax or semantics, lack of understanding of writing conventions, and/or lack of clarity make it difficult for the reader to understand the work.	0-6
<b>Minimally acceptable</b> , below average writing quality. Numerous errors of syntax and/or semantics. Frequently unclear narrative.	7-9
<b>Average</b> writing quality. Some occasional major or minor errors in language but narrative is generally clear; report shows evidence of a competent but still developing writer.	10-12
<b>Above average</b> writing quality, with few, if any, language errors. Very clear narrative, reflecting advanced writing skills.	13-15
Quality of presentation	Marks
<b>Unacceptable</b> level of presentation of work, with significant carelessness and/or little attention to detail (e.g., lack of agreement between in-text citations and reference list, missing information, lack of proofreading).	0-1
<b>Minimally acceptable</b> level of presentation, with major errors of carelessness and/or general lack of attention to detail (e.g., lack of agreement between in-text citations and reference list, missing information, lack of proofreading).	2
<b>Acceptable</b> level of presentation, with some errors of carelessness and/or lack of attention to detail.	3-4
<b>Professional</b> quality of presentation, with few or no errors of carelessness and thorough attention to detail throughout.	5

## Annex 1: Record of supervisory meetings - EMP 3025

*To be completed at the end of each meeting held; a copy should be retained by both the student and the supervisor.*

<b>Date of meeting:</b>
<b>Key points discussed:</b>
<b>Actions to be completed by student before next meeting:</b>
<b>Any actions required from supervisor before next meeting:</b>

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Student's name*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Supervisor's name*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Student's signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Supervisor's signature*

## Annex 2: Proposal submission form

Proposed project title:

Please indicate whether your project will be research-oriented or practice-oriented (tick):

Research-oriented	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------	--------------------------

Practice-oriented	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------	--------------------------

*Supervisor declaration:*

I have reviewed the attached project proposal and approve its submission.

Name of proposed supervisor

Signature of proposed supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Student's name*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Student's signature*