

AGS Book Prize Reports – Assessment Framework

Date of Version: 20 August 2019

Attributes:

Reports are to be assessed in respect of content (60%) and quality of writing (40%).

Ranking:

Both 'content' and 'quality of writing' will each be ranked in terms of 'Outstanding', 'very good', 'good', 'fair' and 'poor', corresponding to Grade 1.0 to 0.9, 0.9 to 0.8, 0.8 to 0.6, 0.6 to 0.4 and below 0.4 of the maximum scores for the particular attribute. The following are general guidelines on ranking the attributes.

Content –

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Outstanding: | focused, complete and accurate on key concepts and knowledge (1.0 to 0.9); |
| Very Good: | focused and accurate on key concepts and knowledge, with some arguable omissions (0.9 to 0.8); |
| Good: | mostly key concepts and knowledge, with some general points included, generally accurate (0.8 to 0.6); |
| Fair: | mixed key and general concepts and knowledge, generally accurate (0.6 to 0.4); |
| Poor: | major mistakes (Below 0.4) |

Quality of writing (With the same marking system as that of the Content Section) –

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Outstanding: | succinct and idiomatic language, logical and coherent structure (1.0 to 0.9); |
| Very Good: | succinct, clear and accurate language, with attention to logic and coherence (0.9 to 0.8); |
| Good: | clear and generally accurate language, with attention to logic and coherence (0.8 to 0.6); |
| Fair: | generally clear and accurate language that is not difficult to follow (0.6 to 0.4); |
| Poor: | unclear or inaccurate language that hinders conveyance of points (Below 0.4). |

General Rules

1. Being a technical report, it should be a concise essay focusing on technical content. It is expected that the candidate should sufficiently use the five hundred words to report the technical content in good quality. The introduction for the role for the clients, or the general description for the project should be short. Expression of gratitude or compliments should be avoided.
2. The report should focus on the 'content' and 'quality of writing'. 'Personal views' are optional, and the absence of such would not undermine the chance of being awarded the book prize. Reports on seminars are not supposed to be a vehicle for personal views, and we could not be too demanding on this. However, a report which shows good personal views on the subject should be awarded up to 10% bonus marks. The total score eventually is limited to 100. 'Personal views' are considered good if they provide additional relevant knowledge, and useful insights or recommendations that have a positive influence on reader's understanding of the subject.
3. Photographs are allowed to be attached to the report in a bid to illustrate facts or enhance comprehension. However, they would not be contributing to nor undermining for marking.
4. The assessor should as far as possible accompany the assessment with one or more statements highlighting noteworthy aspects of the report being assessed.
5. The essays from the potential candidates may be edited by the assessors in order to improve the quality of them. Besides, the assessors may also ask for the candidates to re-write part of the content if it is considered to be necessary.

6. Plagiarism is as simple as copying information with sentences or the whole paragraphs from the work of the original authors, and it shall be completely avoided. If the candidate believes that certain sentences are prerequisites for copying from journals, research papers, or other sources of news, they should be shown with quotation marks and the sources. Otherwise, the Judge Panel will completely reject the article. It is acceptable and highly appreciated that the candidate should rewrite with their own words except that some of the author's special terms can be copied directly.

Award

A book prize award would generally be considered for any report scoring 60% or more. This would correspond to being 'Good' in both of content and quality of writing.

The AGS tradition has been to offer the Prize to the best record of an event. This should continue. Two awards will be made in the very special circumstances that both reports are equally strong, to the extent that they could not be fairly ranked for relative merit, or that one is marginally less meritorious than the other but had been given the expectation of success in securing the prize.

| Overall Scores (100%) | Total Marks from Assessors | | Overall Scores ⁽ⁱ⁾ | Remarks |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| | Content (60%) | Quality of Writing (40%) | | |
| Name of Candidate | (Range: 1 to 0.4, <0.4) | (Range: 1 to 0.4, <0.4) | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | From Assessor 1 |
| | | | | From Assessor 2 |
| | | | | From Assessor 3 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | From Assessor 1 |
| | | | | From Assessor 2 |
| | | | | From Assessor 3 |
| Comment from Assessors: | | | | |

(i) Overall scores are limited to 100% even if bonus scores are awarded for good personal views.

Editorial Improvement

A report should be assessed as it stands.

The author of a prize winning report might be contacted for editorial improvements. AGS reserves the right not to upload a prize winning report before the editorial comments have been resolved.

END