

Marking grid	Wtg	D	P	F	Ab	Comments
Introduction	5				P3	Brief and to the point.
Literature review	20				D1	<p>Generally good, and you have clearly made an effort to find up to date papers. You can save words and improve readability by replacing structures like "According to Augustyniak et al (2005)..." with a simple exposition of your line of argument.</p> <p>BTW, this report may be interesting for you http://www.theregister.co.uk/2012/03/05/navigation_not_very_good_on_uk_council_websites/</p>
Research approach	25				P3	<p>Good, covers all the main requirements well (elements from the methodology were considered here too). However, it is not clear how the questions you ask reflect the literature review.</p> <p>It would have been a good idea to include the tool as a table with justifications of the questions - it would not have affected your word count.</p> <p>Most importantly, this report takes on too much for the scope allowed by a 2000 coursework. It would have been better to limit the work to a representative sample of 3-5 sites.</p>
Data analysis	25				P3	Good work, though sources are needed to support demographic statements.
Conclusion	15				P3	Good critical reflection but clear recommendations are lacking - which is a shame, considering the amount of work you clearly put into this.
Format and referencing	10				P3	The document is well laid out, but there are some silly mistakes. For instance, the bibliography is not in alphabetical order, and should appear *before* the appendices (an important point in long documents).

Legend

D - Distinction	P - Pass	F - Fail	Ab - Absent	Ex - Excellent	Gd - Good	Pr - Poor	Un - Unacceptable
-----------------	----------	----------	-------------	----------------	-----------	-----------	-------------------