|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Master of Design**  School of Industrial Design  Carleton University  Milestone 2 - Annotated Bibliography | | |
| In developing an annotated bibliography, you are creating a summary and evaluation of the sources for your thesis study. This is more useful than just collecting sources for a bibliography because it forces you to read each source carefully and critically. This activity helps you explore your area of interest from multiple perspectives with the intent of developing a comprehensive overview of your research topic within the existing literature, and where your research focus fits within this context. For more guidance on how to write an annotated bibliography, please refer to these additional resources:  Writing an Annotated Bibliography  <https://library.carleton.ca/help/writing-annotated-bibliography>  How to Prepare an Annotated Bibliography: The Annotated Bibliography  <https://guides.library.cornell.edu/annotatedbibliography>  Writing an annotated bibliography  <https://www.monash.edu/rlo/assignment-samples/arts/writing-an-annotated-bibliography>  This thesis activity takes place in the Winter semester of your first year in the Master of Design program. During this time, students summarize, assess, evaluate, and reflect on a minimum of 10~15 relevant resources with a brief explanation of why the sources are credible and relevant to their research topic. This must be listed in alphabetical order and follow the APA style guide.  Milestone 2 must be submitted to your SID thesis supervisor, external co-supervisor (if known) and the Graduate Program Coordinator by the end of the Winter exam period, **April 27th, 2021.**   |  | | --- | | This example can be found on: Writing an Annotated Bibliography  <https://library.carleton.ca/help/writing-annotated-bibliography>  McNab, David T. "Who is on Trial? Teme-Augama Anishnabai Land Rights and George Ironside, Junior: Re-Considering Oral Tradition." Canadian Journal of Native Studies [Canada] 18.1 (1998): pp. 117-33.            This research note is an examination of significant documents that were presented during the litigation of the Temagami court case concerning land rights, the Robinson-Huron Treaty of 1850, and annuities. McNab argues that the oral tradition of the Teme-Augama Anishnabai is accurate, showing that they never participated in the treaty and never accepted annuities according to Aboriginal oral history.  He provides a good narrative about aboriginal oral history traditions which is intended to generate historical debate on this issue. Some of the questions he raises are about fairness and justice on the issues of Aboriginal title and land rights. The endnotes and list of references are both informative and especially useful for further research. | | | |
| **Student name** |  |
| **SID Supervisor & Co-supervisor (if known)** |  |
| **Date** |  |

**Evaluation guideline**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **Annotation Quality** | The annotations show an *inadequate review* and very limited understanding of the source content, quality, and relevance to the research topic. Potential insights are not presented. | The annotations show a *deficient review* and understanding of the source content, quality, and relevance to the research topic. Some potential insights are presented but are lacking in depth. | The annotations show an *adequate review* and understanding of the source content, quality, and relevance to the research topic. Potential insights emerge with some preliminary level of depth. | The annotations show a *good review* and understanding of the source content, quality, and relevance to the research topic. Critical insights are presented more consistently and are linked to the research focus. | The annotations show a *very careful review* and clear understanding of the source content, quality, and relevance to the research topic. Critical insights are presented throughout and are linked to the research focus. |
| **Attention to Research Methods** | There is no discussion about the research method/s used in any of the resources. | There is very limited discussion about the research method/s used in some of the resources. | There is some discussion about the research method/s used in most of the resources. | There is discussion about the research method/s used in all of the resources. | There is a critical discussion about the research method/s used in all of the resources. |
| **Writing Quality**  spelling  grammar  sentence structure | Errors distract the reader to the extent that the meaning is unclear. | Errors are distracting for the reader, but the meaning is somewhat clear. | Some errors are present, but overall the meaning is clear to the reader. | A few minor errors are present and do not distract the reader. The meaning is clear. | The work is virtually free from writing errors and the meaning is clear. |
| **Referencing** | There is little or no adherence to the APA referencing guidelines. | There are many referencing errors. There is limited adherence to the APA referencing guidelines. | There are some referencing errors. There is adherence to most aspects of the APA referencing guidelines. | There are very few referencing errors. There is adherence to almost all aspects of the APA referencing guidelines. | There are no referencing errors. There is adherence to all aspects of the APA referencing guidelines. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Marked by** |  |
| Comments |  |
| Final mark (out of 20) |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **20 out of 20** | *Excellent* |
| **16 out of 20** | *Very good* |
| **12 out of 20** | *Acceptable* |
| **8 out of 20** | *Below standard* |
| **4 out of 20** | *Unacceptable* |