

Marking criteria & feedback forms 2013/2014

Department of Life Sciences

Biology and Biochemistry degrees

Contents

Examination and coursework essays: assessment criteria	2
Coursework essays: cover sheet and feedback	3
Laboratory reports: assessment criteria	4
Laboratory reports: cover sheet and feedback.....	5
Presentations: assessment criteria	6
Presentations: feedback	7
Final-year <i>Research Project</i> and <i>Literature Project</i> oral vivas: assessment criteria.....	8
Final-year <i>Research Project</i> and <i>Literature Project</i> presentation and oral viva: report	9
Posters: assessment criteria	11
Posters: feedback.....	12
Dissertations (including second-year <i>Tutored Dissertation</i> and final-year <i>Literature Project</i>): assessment criteria .	13
Second-year <i>Tutored Dissertation</i> : Tutor's feedback	14
Second-year <i>Tutored Dissertation</i> : Second Marker's feedback.....	16
Final-year <i>Literature Project</i> thesis: Supervisor/Examiner's report.....	18
Research project theses (including final-year <i>Research Project</i>): assessment criteria.....	19
Final-year <i>Research Project</i> thesis: Examiner's report.....	20
Final-year <i>Research Project</i> thesis and lab/field-work performance: Supervisor's report.....	22
Final year <i>Literature Project Lay Summary for Science Communication</i> : assessment criteria	24
Final year <i>Literature Project Lay Summary for Science Communication</i> : report	25
Year in Industry placement account: assessment criteria	26
Year in Europe cultural report: assessment criteria.....	27

Examination and coursework essays: assessment criteria

Account will be taken of what can reasonably be expected in the time available for examination essays, within a word limit for an essay or dissertation, and for the year of the degree. **In particular, the amount of supplementary material* and degree of independent critical*, analytical* or synthetic* treatment expected of a final year student are much higher than that expected in Year 1.**

Class	%	Criteria
1st	100	Answer is a masterful exposition of the subject , showing command of the relevant concepts and facts, normally including considerable well-chosen supplementary material*, and providing very good independent critical*, analytical* and/or synthetic* treatment of the information.
	95	
	90	
	85	Answer gives an excellent account of at virtually all of the expected relevant material. Shows excellent comprehension* and application* of the relevant concepts and facts. Provides consistently analytical*, critical* and/or synthetic* treatment of the information and/or includes considerable well-chosen supplementary material* .
	80	
	76	Answer gives an excellent account of virtually all of the expected relevant material . Shows excellent comprehension* and application* of the relevant concepts and facts. In addition, provides some analytical*, critical* and/or synthetic* treatment of the information and/or includes some relevant supplementary material* .
72		
2A	68	Answer gives a well-organised, mainly accurate and well-written account of the relevant concepts and facts, containing at least two-thirds of the expected relevant material . Demonstrates comprehension* and/or application* of the relevant concepts, and lacks significant errors of understanding . <i>N.B. Coursework assignments must be written concisely with appropriate and basically correct use of references to attain a 2A mark or higher.</i>
	65	
	62	
2B	58	Answer gives an account of at least one-half to two-thirds of the expected relevant material , but is marred by defective organisation, omissions or errors that indicate a lack of clear understanding of the concepts. <i>N.B. Coursework assignments that are too long, poorly written, and/or that show inappropriate and/or incorrect use of references are unlikely to be marked above a 2B.</i>
	55	
	52	
3rd	48	Answer presents one-third to one-half of the expected relevant material , but is marred by major errors, brevity, and/or irrelevance.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Answer presents one-quarter to one-third of the expected relevant material (<i>e.g.</i> a sketchy outline of a correct answer), but is marred by major errors or brevity.
	35	
	30	
	25	Answer presents more than three concepts or facts but less than one-quarter of the expected relevant material and is too inaccurate, irrelevant, or brief to indicate more than a vague understanding of the question.
	20	
	15	Answer presents only three concepts or facts that are correct and relevant to the question.
	10	Answer presents only two concepts or facts that are correct and relevant to the question.
	5	Answer presents at most one concept or fact that is correct and relevant to the question.
0	Answer contains nothing that is both correct and relevant to the question. Mark given where the work presented is discovered not to be that of the candidate (plagiarised).	

Footnotes: **Supplementary material** includes outside reading and material from other courses. For first- and second-year students, textbooks are an acceptable source of outside reading; for final-year students, outside reading should normally come from journal articles or other peer-reviewed publications. **Analytical** = breaking a concept down into its parts and examining their inter-relationships, *e.g.* comparing and contrasting two models. **Critical** = judging a hypothesis or conclusion by examining the validity of the evidence presented for it, *e.g.* evaluating two competing models. **Synthetic** = integrating concepts from several sources. *e.g.* discussing relevant outside reading, or combining material across several lectures or courses into a coherent or original whole. **Comprehension** = understanding of the meaning of information, *e.g.* explaining how one concept follows logically from another. **Application** = use of knowledge outside of the situation in which it was learnt, *e.g.* applying a model to a novel situation, or carrying out an appropriate manipulation of a data set.

Coursework essays: cover sheet and feedback

Stick your name label over this text		<p>Plagiarism is cheating. Plagiarism is the use of someone else's work without proper acknowledgement, presenting it as your own. Any plagiarism discovered in this work will result in a penalty, varying from deduction of marks to more serious disciplinary action, according to the severity of the offence. By attaching this form to your work, you are declaring that this work is free from plagiarism as defined by the college policy:</p> <p>http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/exams/examoffences</p>	
Marker:		Partner/Group (if any)	
(Office use only) Work should be returned by:			
<p>Complete, gives sufficient relevant information disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree (Main omissions given below)</p>	<p>Accurate, containing no significant errors disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree (Main errors given below or on work)</p>	<p>Well organised, consistent disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree</p>	<p>Written in good and concise English disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree</p>
<p>Logical, shows comprehension or application disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree</p>	<p>Analytical, critical, describes limitations, argues points disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree</p>	<p>Synthetic, bringing together well-chosen, reliable sources disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree</p>	<p>Referenced correctly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree</p>
<p>Good points</p>			
<p>What, if anything, was misunderstood or omitted?</p>			
<p>Other suggestions for improvement</p>			
First mark & marker's initials	Second mark & marker's initials	Agreed mark:	
Explanation of agreed mark			

Laboratory reports: assessment criteria

These criteria are used to assess all laboratory work during your degree course, from first year to final year practical classes. Account is taken of the relevant year of the degree programme, the nature of the work, and the instructions provided. Due allowance is made for what is reasonably achievable under laboratory conditions and in the time available. Marks may be deducted for failure to attend all or part of a laboratory class.

Class	%	Criteria
1st	100	Report demonstrates complete command of the background and context of the work, gives an accurate and logical account of the methods, presents and analyses the results with clarity, correctly applies any necessary mathematical/statistical techniques to the results, and provides very good independent analytical* and critical* treatment when discussing the methods, results, implications and limitations (with evidence of substantial outside reading* where appropriate).
	95	
	90	
	85	Practical completed successfully and report very well presented, without significant deficiencies. Consistently analytical and critical treatment of methods, results, implications, and limitations. Evidence of outside reading* where appropriate.
	80	
	76	Practical completed successfully and report very well presented, without significant deficiencies. Provides evidence of limited outside reading* and/or some analytical* and critical* treatment of methods, results, implications, and limitations.
	72	
2A	68	Report is complete and mainly accurate, without significant errors of understanding or calculation , demonstrating comprehension* of the context, methods and limitations of the work. Results are presented clearly. <i>N.B. Reports must be written concisely to attain a 2A mark or higher.</i>
	65	
	62	
2B	58	Report (i) shows a reasonable grasp of the background and context of the work, and (ii) gives an accurate account of most of the experimental procedures and results , but (iii) does not go beyond that, or does go beyond it but is marred by omissions or significant errors that indicate a lack of clear understanding of the techniques used. <i>N.B. Reports that are too long and/or poorly written are unlikely to be marked above a 2B.</i>
	55	
	52	
3rd	48	Report (i) shows only a relatively weak grasp of the background and context of the work and (ii) contains major errors or omissions, but (iii) presents a mainly accurate account of at least a third of the experimental procedures and results.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Work (i) shows partial understanding of the experiment and (ii) presents less than a third of the experimental procedures and results.
	35	
	30	
	25	Report is (i) too inaccurate, irrelevant, or brief to indicate more than a vague understanding of the practical and (ii) presents only about a quarter of the procedures and results
	20	
	15	Report presents only two or three concepts or facts that are relevant and correct.
	10	
	5	Practical attempted , but no relevant experimental procedures, results or discussion.
	0	Practical not attempted, work not handed in or contains nothing correct that is relevant. Mark given where the work presented is discovered not to be that of the candidate (plagiarised). Further disciplinary action is usually taken in cases of plagiarism.

Footnotes: **Analytical** = breaking a concept down into its parts and examining their inter-relationships, *e.g.* comparing and contrasting two models. **Critical** = judging a hypothesis or conclusion by examining the validity of the evidence presented for it, *e.g.* evaluating two competing models. **Outside reading** – for first- and second-year students, textbooks are an acceptable source of outside reading; for final-year students, outside reading should normally come from journal articles or other peer-reviewed publications. **Comprehension** = understanding of the meaning of information, *e.g.* explaining how one concept follows logically from another.

Laboratory reports: cover sheet and feedback

Stick your name label over this text		<p>Plagiarism is cheating. Plagiarism is the use of someone else's work without proper acknowledgement, presenting it as your own. Any plagiarism discovered in this work will result in a penalty, varying from deduction of marks to more serious disciplinary action, according to the severity of the offence. By attaching this form to your work, you are declaring that this work is free from plagiarism as defined by the college policy:</p> <p>http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/exams/examoffences</p>	
Marker:		Partner/Group (if any)	
(Office use only) Work should be returned by:			
<p>Complete, with sufficient detail of methods/results disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree (Main omissions given below)</p>	<p>Accurate, free from errors in understanding/calculation disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree (Main errors given below or on work)</p>	<p>Well organised; results presented clearly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree</p>	<p>Written in good and concise English disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree</p>
<p>Logical, shows comprehension of context, methods & limitations disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree</p>	<p>Analytical & critical when handling methods, results, implications & limitations disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree</p>	<p>Places work in context; clear use of outside reading disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree</p>	<p>Referenced correctly disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree</p>
<p>Good points</p> 			
<p>What, if anything, was misunderstood, omitted or apparently carried out incorrectly?</p> 			
<p>Other suggestions for improvement</p> 			
First mark & marker's initials	Second mark & marker's initials	Agreed mark:	
Explanation of agreed mark			

Presentations: assessment criteria

These criteria are used to assess all oral presentations during your degree course, including those for final-year *Research Reviews* and *Research Projects*. Account is taken of the relevant year of the degree programme, the teaching of the subject, the instructions provided for the work and the type of presentation. Allowance is made for what is reasonably achievable under the conditions of the presentation (resources available, time allowed, whether group or individual presentation, etc.).

Class	%	Criteria
1st	100	Presentation does an excellent job of communicating a very substantial body of scientific information. The presenter held the audience's attention , showed command of the relevant concepts and facts , spoke authoritatively and without obvious notes , showed evidence of substantial background reading* (where appropriate), provided a consistently analytical*, critical* and/or synthetic* treatment of the information (where relevant), gave excellent answers to questions , and showed fluency in the use of any teaching aids (PowerPoint, demonstrations, handouts, PRS clickers, etc). Any visual aids were conference-level .
	95	
	90	
	85	
	80	
	76	
2A	68	Presentation very effectively communicates a significant body of scientific information, being a logically-structured exposition enabling the audience to appreciate the significance of the material presented. Presentations in this range would generally be expected to show the following characteristics: appropriate background reading* , good critical* , analytical* or synthetic* treatment of the information , no evidence of significant errors of understanding during the talk or in answers to questions, used resources well , spoke without detailed notes , little or no hesitation , and kept more or less to time .
	65	
	62	
2B	58	Presentation successfully communicates a significant body of scientific information. It is a mostly accurate account of most of the expected relevant material , showing evidence of some background reading* and adequate preparation , but is marred by confused sections, poor use of resources, over-run, omissions, errors, hesitation, irrelevance (<i>e.g.</i> slides that do not add value), over-reliance on non-primary sources, or by reading from notes.
	55	
	52	
3rd	48	Presentation achieves only limited communication of scientific information, containing major errors or omissions. Presenter delivers a mainly accurate account of at least a third of the expected relevant material , showing a generally weak understanding and evidence of little background reading* or preparation.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Presentation fails to communicate any significant scientific information. Presenter demonstrates understanding of less than a third of the expected relevant material (either through errors, through lack of preparation, or by omission).
	35	
	30	
	25	Presentation fails to communicate scientific information and is on balance misleading. It shows understanding of less than a quarter of the expected relevant material , but is so inaccurate and/or irrelevant that it succeeds only in misinforming and confusing the audience.
	20	
	15	Presentation includes very little that is correct and relevant .
	10	
	5	
0	Presentation not given.	

Footnotes: Background reading – For first- and second-year students, the sources suggested by the lecturer should suffice; final-year students should generally look to supplement this from journal articles or other peer-reviewed publications. **Analytical** = breaking a concept down into its parts and examining their inter-relationships, *e.g.* comparing and contrasting two models. **Critical** = judging a hypothesis or conclusion by examining the validity of the evidence presented for it, *e.g.* evaluating two competing models. **Synthetic** = integrating concepts from several sources. *e.g.* discussing relevant background reading, or combining material across several lectures or courses into a coherent or original whole.

Presentations: feedback

Student:		Presentation date:	
Marker:		Partner/Group (if any)	
Complete, communicating much scientific information disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree (Main omissions given below)	Accurate, no significant errors disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree (Main errors given below)	Well-structured, relevant, kept to time disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Authoritative & engaging; no hesitation or over-reliance on notes disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree
Well-researched, appropriately referenced and well-prepared disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Analytical & critical disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Used any teaching aids/visual aids well disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Answered questions well, showing good knowledge of background and detail disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree
Good points 			
What, if anything, was misunderstood, presented incorrectly or omitted? 			
Other suggestions for improvement 			
First mark & marker's initials	Second mark & marker's initials	Agreed mark:	
Explanation of agreed mark			

Final-year *Research Project* and *Literature Project* oral vivas: assessment criteria

These criteria are used to assess oral vivas of final-year practical *Research Projects* and *Literature Projects*.

Class	%	Criteria
1st	100	The student did an excellent job of communicating a very substantial body of scientific information. The student gave accurate and logical answers , showed command of the relevant concepts and facts , spoke authoritatively , showed abundant evidence of knowledge and understanding beyond that which had been provided in the dissertation and /or presentation , provided a consistently analytical*, critical* and/or synthetic* treatment information in their answers (where relevant). The student demonstrated an appreciation of the limitations of the experimental or other procedures, and showed clear and possibly novel insight into the subject. The student was able robustly to defend criticism of the strategy, ideas or information provided in the dissertation and / or the presentation.
	95	
	90	
	85	The student did an excellent job of communicating a very substantial body of scientific information. They met all of the criteria for a mark of 68, as well as meeting most but not all of the criteria for a mark of 90+ .
	80	
	76	The student did an excellent job of communicating a very substantial body of scientific information. They met all the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as meeting one or a few of the qualities of a 90+ presentation .
72		
2A	68	The student effectively communicated a significant body of scientific information, enabling the examiner to appreciate the significance of the material presented. Vivas in this range would generally be expected to show the following characteristics: good evidence of knowledge and understanding beyond that which had been provided in the dissertation and /or presentation , good critical*, analytical* or synthetic* ability in developing answers to questions, no evidence of significant errors of understanding during answers to questions, sound knowledge of how the study fits in to the relevant literature and some ability to defend criticism of the strategy, ideas or information provided in the dissertation and / or presentation.
	65	
	62	
2B	58	The student successfully communicated a body of scientific information. The viva revealed a mostly accurate understanding of the material presented in the dissertation and / or presentation , showing evidence of adequate preparation , but was marred by some confused answers, omissions, errors, hesitation or irrelevance. There was little evidence of knowledge and understanding beyond that which had been provided in the dissertation and / or presentation .
	55	
	52	
3rd	48	The student achieved only limited communication of scientific information, with major errors or omissions. The student demonstrated an understanding of at least a third of the material presented in the dissertation and / or presentation , but showed little evidence of preparation. There was no evidence of knowledge and understanding beyond that which had been provided in the dissertation and / or presentation .
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	The student failed to communicate any significant scientific information. The student demonstrated understanding of less than a third of the material presented in the dissertation and / or presentation (either through errors, or by omission).
	35	
	30	
	25	The student failed to communicate scientific information and was on balance misleading. They demonstrated understanding of less than a quarter of the material presented in the dissertation and / or presentation , but answers were so inaccurate and/or irrelevant that they succeeded only in largely misinforming and confusing the examiner.
	20	
	15	The student provided few or no answers that were correct and relevant .
	10	
	5	
0	Viva not attended.	

Footnotes: **Analytical** = breaking a concept down into its parts and examining their inter-relationships, *e.g.* comparing and contrasting two models. **Critical** = judging a hypothesis or conclusion by examining the validity of the evidence presented for it, *e.g.* evaluating two competing models. **Synthetic** = integrating concepts from several sources. *e.g.* discussing relevant background reading, or combining material into a coherent or original whole.

Final-year *Research Project* and *Literature Project* presentation and oral viva: report

Student name			
Project Title			
First Examiner's name			
Second Examiner's name			
Date			
Presentation			
Statement of aims	<i>incoherent</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>very clear</i>
Development of plan or theme	<i>unclear</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>very clear and logical</i>
Structure of presentation	<i>badly disorganised</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>logical and well organised</i>
Amount of material	<i>too little, too superficial</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>appropriate</i>
Quality of text on slides	<i>too much, cannot read</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>high impact, excellent visibility</i>
Diagrams and images	<i>irrelevant / poor quality</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>highly relevant, excellent quality</i>
Emphasis of important points	<i>unclear</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>clearly done</i>
Summary/conclusion	<i>absent</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>concise and appropriate</i>
Timekeeping	<i>poor</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>excellent</i>
Audibility	<i>too quiet, monotone</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>clear and lively and varied tone</i>
Rapport with audience	<i>poor</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>lively and good eye contact</i>
Presentation - Good points			
Presentation - What, if anything, was misunderstood or omitted?			
First mark & marker's initials	Second mark & marker's initials	Agreed Mark:	
Explanation of agreed mark			

Please Turn Over for Viva assessment

Viva			
Discussion of aims of the project	<i>confused</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>extensive</i>
Discussion of results	<i>shallow</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>extensive</i>
Understanding of methods	<i>shallow</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>extensive</i>
Understanding of theory associated with project	<i>shallow</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>extensive</i>
Broader understanding of the subject area	<i>shallow</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>extensive</i>
Understanding of 'core' or 'basic' material	<i>shallow</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>extensive</i>
Scientific rigour	<i>weak</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>strict</i>
Ideas for further research	<i>none</i>	□ □ □ □ □	<i>plenty</i>
Viva - Good points			
Viva - What, if anything, was misunderstood or omitted?			
First mark & marker's initials	Second mark & marker's initials	Agreed Mark:	
Explanation of agreed mark			

Posters: assessment criteria

These criteria are to be used for posters, including the mini-poster for the final year *Research Project*. Allowances will be made for what can reasonably be expected for the year of the degree: a poster of final year standard will not be expected from a first year student.

Class	%	Criteria
1 st	100	Poster does an excellent job of communicating the most important scientific information. It presents the information in an eye-catching and visually attractive way. The material is laid out cleanly, logically and accessibly . Images (where present) are of high quality . The content of the poster has been well researched and correctly referenced . The presenter(s) of the poster showed command of the relevant concepts and facts when explaining the poster and/or answering questions.
	95	
	90	
	85	Excellent poster, meeting all the criteria for a mark of 68 and most but not all of the criteria for a mark of 90+ .
	80	
	76	Excellent poster, meeting all the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as one or a few of the criteria for a mark of 90+ .
	72	
2A	68	Poster is attractive and laid out in a largely logical fashion , very effectively communicating the significance of a body of scientific information. Posters in this range would generally be expected to show the following characteristics: appropriate background reading* ; some critical* , analytical* or synthetic* treatment of the information ; no evidence of significant errors of understanding in the poster or when answering questions.
	65	
	62	
2B	58	Poster conveys information adequately, but it is marred by omissions or errors, or is laid out in a way that significantly detracts from the content of the poster (<i>e.g.</i> misplaced emphasis). Nonetheless, the poster or its presenter(s) demonstrates understanding of most of the relevant expected material .
	55	
	52	
3 rd	48	Poster is marred by major errors, brevity; irrelevance, or poor design (as laid out below); however, either the poster or its presenter(s) demonstrates understanding of at least a third of the expected relevant material .
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Poster demonstrates understanding of less than a third of the expected relevant material , and is marred by major errors, brevity, or inappropriate design. The presenter(s) did not answer questions well enough to convincingly demonstrate adequate knowledge and understanding.
	35	
	30	
	25	Poster demonstrates understanding of less than a quarter of the expected relevant material , whether through omission of material, poor execution (<i>e.g.</i> , unlabelled figures) or errors. Typically the poster will show most of the following failings: inadequate graphics, illegibility, overcrowding, large gaps, missing abstract/summary, lack of attention to detail, lack of material.
	20	
	15	Poster is so poor as to indicate its presenter(s) did not understand what a poster is supposed to achieve. Conveys much less than a quarter of the expected relevant material .
	10	
	5	
0	Poster not produced.	

Footnotes: **Background reading** – For first- and second-year students, the sources suggested by the lecturer should suffice; final-year students should generally look to supplement this from journal articles or other peer-reviewed publications. **Analytical** = breaking a concept down into its parts and examining their inter-relationships, *e.g.* comparing and contrasting two models. **Critical** = judging a hypothesis or conclusion by examining the validity of the evidence presented for it, *e.g.* evaluating two competing models. **Synthetic** = integrating concepts from several sources. *e.g.* discussing relevant background reading, or combining material across several lectures or courses into a coherent or original whole.

Posters: feedback

Student:		Poster name:	
Marker:		Partner/Group (if any)	
Clearly communicates all key scientific information disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree (Main omissions given below)	Accurate, no significant errors disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree (Main errors given below)	Logically laid-out and easy to follow disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Eye-catching and visually appealing disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree
Well-researched, appropriately referenced and well-prepared disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Analytical, critical and synthetic disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Poster or presenter shows understanding of the topic disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Presenter explained the poster well and answered questions fully disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree
Good points 			
What, if anything, was misunderstood or omitted? 			
Other suggestions for improvement 			
First mark & marker's initials	Second mark & marker's initials	Agreed mark:	
Explanation of agreed mark			

Dissertations (including second-year *Tutored Dissertation* and final-year *Literature Project*): assessment criteria

These criteria are for 2nd-year *Tutored Dissertations* by Biology students, *Critical Reviews* for Year in Europe/Industry students, and final-year *Literature Projects*. Outside reading is fundamental in dissertations, forming most of the expected relevant material, so is not mentioned explicitly below. Textbooks may be a useful start for Tutored Dissertations, but most outside reading should be from the peer-reviewed literature, including primary research papers. Allowance will be made for the student's year of study and, for placements, the placement duration.

Class	%	Criteria
1 st	100	Dissertation is of sufficient quality and scientific novelty to submit to an international peer-reviewed journal .
	95	Dissertation is a succinct survey of the most important relevant primary literature , with thoughtful selection of relevant material and real attention to detail (in references, figures, <i>etc.</i>). The dissertation provides consistently analytical* and critical* treatment of the information and independently synthesises a structured argument and/or novel testable hypothesis . Any necessary mathematical, statistical or bioinformatic techniques are described logically and applied knowledgeably , and any results or meta-analyses are presented in a publishable format .
	90	
	85	Dissertation meets all the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as meeting most but not all of the criteria for a mark of 90+ .
	80	
	76	Dissertation meets all the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as meeting one or a few of the criteria for a mark of 90+ .
	72	
2A	68	Dissertation is a very good, logically structured exposition of the subject , showing a clear grasp of the relevant concepts and facts . It provides some critical*, analytical* or synthetic* treatment of the information and is well-presented . <i>N.B. Dissertations must be written concisely with appropriate and basically correct use of references to attain a 2A mark or higher</i>
	65	
	62	
2B	58	Dissertation gives a good and mostly accurate account of most of the subject area , showing a grasp of the basic concepts and facts , but does not go beyond that or goes beyond it but is marred by significant errors. Dissertations in this range are likely to show fairly extensive reliance on non-primary sources (<i>e.g.</i> reviews), and a lack of insight into or failure to comprehend parts of the subject matter. <i>N.B. Dissertations that are too long, poorly written, and/or that show inappropriate and/or incorrect use of references are unlikely to be marked above a 2B.</i>
	55	
	52	
3 rd	48	Dissertation is just acceptable, demonstrating basic understanding of more than a third of the expected amount of relevant material , but does not identify and use sufficient relevant source material, and/or presents material in an inconsistent, incomplete, incorrect or unscientific way. Dissertations in this range are likely to lack clear structure, to be written in an unscientific style, and to be marred by significant errors.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Dissertation demonstrates understanding of less than a third of the expected amount of relevant material , because of brevity, misunderstanding and/or errors in presentation. It shows insufficient understanding of the literature for degree level.
	35	
	30	
	25	Dissertation demonstrates understanding of less than a quarter of the expected amount of relevant material , because of brevity, misunderstanding and/or errors in presentation.
	20	
	15	Dissertation contains only a few sentences that are correct and relevant to the subject.
	10	
	5	
0	Dissertation not handed in or contains nothing of relevance to the subject.	

Footnotes: **Analytical** = breaking a concept down into its parts and examining their inter-relationships, *e.g.* comparing and contrasting two models. **Critical** = judging a hypothesis or conclusion by examining the validity of the evidence presented for it, *e.g.* evaluating two competing models. **Synthetic** = integrating concepts from several sources into a coherent or original whole

Second-year *Tutored Dissertation*: Tutor's feedback

Student:		Dissertation:	
Tutor/Supervisor:		Date	
Dates of meetings:			
Complete, no significant omissions disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree (Main omissions given below)	Accurate, containing no significant errors disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree (Main errors given below or on work)	Well structured, relevant, concise and neat disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Written in good English with clear, informative figures/tables disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree
Logical explanations; shows comprehension, application or insight disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Analytical & critical treatment of material disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Provides an independent synthesis of material disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Well-researched and correctly-referenced disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree
Good points 			
What, if anything, was misunderstood or omitted? 			
Other suggestions for improvement 			
Please use table overleaf for mark awarded and signature			

Students are not given their marks immediately and DO NOT SEE this side of the sheet.

This side is for comments regarding moderation or agreement of marks.

Tutor/Supervisor mark		Tutor/Supervisor initials	
Agreed mark		Second marker's initials	

Second-year *Tutored Dissertation*: Second Marker's feedback

Student:		Dissertation:	
Second Marker:		Date	
Complete, no significant omissions disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree (Main omissions given below)	Accurate, containing no significant errors disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree (Main errors given below or on work)	Well structured, relevant, concise and neat disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Written in good English with clear, informative figures/tables disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree
Logical explanations; shows comprehension, application or insight disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Analytical & critical treatment of material disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Provides an independent synthesis of material disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree	Well-researched and correctly-referenced disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree
Good points 			
What, if anything, was misunderstood or omitted? 			
Other suggestions for improvement 			
Please use table overleaf for mark awarded and signature			

Students are not given their marks immediately and DO NOT SEE this side of the sheet.

This side is for comments regarding moderation or agreement of marks.

Second Marker mark		Second Marker initials	
Agreed mark		Tutor/Supervisor initials	

Final-year *Literature Project* thesis: Supervisor/Examiner's report

Student name			
Project Title			
Supervisor/Examiner's name			
Date			
Presentation	<i>messy, poor English</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
Abstract	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
Introduction	<i>trivial</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publishable</i>
Literature coverage	<i>very shallow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>extensive and deep</i>
Accuracy of the information	<i>major errors and omissions</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>full command of the material</i>
Figures/legends/tables	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>perfectly clear, complete</i>
Discussion	<i>very shallow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
References	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>fully accurate</i>
Analytical skills	<i>poor</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>outstanding</i>
Critical analysis	<i>very shallow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>outstanding</i>
Understanding/insight	<i>very little</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>research level</i>
Scientific rigor	<i>weak</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>strict</i>
Originality of expression	<i>derivative</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>innovative/highly original</i>
Good points			
What, if anything, was misunderstood or omitted?			
Mark & initials:			

Research project theses (including final-year *Research Project*): assessment criteria

These criteria are to be used for final-year *Research Projects* and *Year in Europe Scientific Reports*. Outside reading is fundamental when writing up a research project, so is not mentioned explicitly in the criteria that follow. Most outside reading should be from the peer-reviewed scientific literature, including primary research papers.

Class	%	Criteria
1 st	100	Thesis is of sufficient quality to submit for publication to an international peer-reviewed journal (assuming, ideally, that positive and negative results have equal merit).
	95	Thesis is close to a publishable standard, containing a succinct survey of the most important primary literature and an accurate and logical account and justification of the methods used . It presents the results in a publishable format , and knowledgeably applies any necessary mathematical and/or statistical techniques . Discussion of results demonstrates high levels of rigour and critical ability in the context of the relevant literature. Thesis demonstrates an appreciation the limitations of the experimental or other procedures, shows attention to detail (in references, figures, <i>etc.</i>), and shows clear and possibly novel insight into the subject.
	90	
	85	Excellent thesis, meeting all of the criteria for a mark of 68 and most but not all of the criteria for a mark of 90+ .
	80	
	76	Excellent thesis, meeting all the criteria for a mark of 68 and one or a few of the criteria for a mark of 90+ .
	72	
2A	68	Very good, well-structured thesis written concisely in good scientific style* and showing the following features: (i) an ability to carry out experimental procedures successfully to generate original results (which may be negative and need not be novel); (ii) a very good understanding of the study design and the methods used to generate and analyse the data; (iii) appropriate – if not high-level – analyses ; (iv) clear presentation of results ; (v) sound knowledge of how the study fits in to the relevant literature ; (vi) some critical interpretation of the results and the study overall.
	65	
	62	
2B	58	Good thesis showing the following features: (i) an ability to follow experimental procedures ; (ii) basic understanding of the relevant concepts and methods ; (iii) mostly logical structure and scientific style ; (iv) reasonable interpretation of the data or information collected; and (iv) a reasonable attempt to relate the results to the contemporary literature .
	55	
	52	<i>N.B. Theses that are too long, poorly written, and/or that show poor use of references are unlikely to be marked above a 2B.</i>
3 rd	48	Acceptable thesis showing the following features: (i) an ability to follow some experimental procedures ; (ii) a weak grasp of most of the relevant concepts and methods ; (iii) need for close guidance in design and interpretation ; and (iv) at best limited relation of the results to the relevant literature . Research projects in this bracket are likely to be marred by significant errors, important omissions, brevity and/or a failure to interpret the data critically.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Poor thesis showing the following features: (i) understanding of less than half of the theoretical basis of the project ; (ii) evidence of widespread difficulty following procedures to generate and analyse data; (iii) need for complete instruction in design and interpretation ; (iv) does not relate the outcome of the experimental work to the literature .
	35	
	30	
	25	Thesis contains more than a few relevant sentences but shows very little understanding of the background to the project, the project design, or the methods used to generate or analyse the data. Students in this bracket are unlikely to have been able to carry out even basic procedures, despite proper instruction.
	20	
	15	Thesis contains only a few sentences relevant to the subject , and does not contain any interpretable results.
	10	
	5	
0	Thesis contains nothing relevant or was not submitted.	

Footnotes: **Scientific style** – Research projects should be written in clear, direct scientific English. Aim to be precise, concise and dispassionate but do not omit important details.

Final-year *Research Project* thesis: Examiner's report

Student name			
Project Title			
Examiner's name			
Date			
Presentation	<i>messy, poor English</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
Abstract	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
Introduction	<i>trivial</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publishable</i>
Literature coverage	<i>very shallow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>extensive and deep</i>
Description of aims	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>perfectly clear</i>
Materials and methods	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>perfectly clear</i>
Description of results	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>perfectly clear</i>
Figures/legends/tables	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>perfectly clear, complete</i>
Quality of data	<i>poor</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>new and publishable</i>
Analysis of data	<i>very shallow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>full stats, etc</i>
Discussion	<i>very shallow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
References	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>fully accurate</i>
Understanding/insight	<i>very little</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>research level</i>
Scientific rigor	<i>weak</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>strict</i>
Originality of expression	<i>derivative</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>innovative/highly original</i>
Good points			
What, if anything, was misunderstood or omitted?			
Mark & initials:			

Final-year *Research Project* lab/field-work: assessment criteria

Class	%	Criteria	
1st	100	Student worked safely, confidently, diligently , and designed appropriate investigations . Student developed a high level of technical expertise . Student kept supervisor informed of progress, but consistently showed initiative and did not require micromanagement. Student contributed very positively to the research group .	
	95		
	90		
	85	85	Student met all of the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as <u>most of the criteria for a mark of 90+</u>
		80	
	76	76	Student met all of the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as <u>one or a few of the criteria for a mark of 90+</u> .
		72	
2A	68	Student's lab or field work was performed competently . The student contributed meaningfully to the experimental design , worked reasonably hard, picked up procedures well , and was able to work largely independently .	
	65		
	62		
2B	58	Student's lab or field work was performed safely throughout . The student had some input into experimental design and worked reasonably hard . The student was able to work usefully with only day-to-day supervision from anyone .	
	55		
	52		
3rd	48	Student showed some ability to follow experimental procedures without close supervision and appreciated safety aspects , but the work was small in quantity and poorly executed. Student's input into experimental design was minimal.	
	45		
	42		
Fail	38	Student worked for up to a half of the expected time and worked safely/adequately only when very closely supervised . Student showed very little or no initiative or independence.	
	35		
	30		
	25	Student attended the laboratory or field site for up to a third of the expected time and performed some work safely/adequately but only when micromanaged . Very little useful work completed.	
	20		
	15	Student attended the laboratory or field site but either attended for less than a quarter of the expected time or worked in an unsafe or otherwise wholly unsatisfactory fashion despite proper instruction. Negligible amount of work completed.	
	10		
	5		
	0	Student did not attend the laboratory or field site, was barred for preventable reasons (e.g., an unacceptable attitude to safety), or was found to have fabricated results.	

Final-year *Research Project* thesis and lab/field-work performance: Supervisor's report

Student name			
Project Title			
Supervisor name			
Date			
Thesis			
Presentation	<i>messy, poor English</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
Abstract	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
Introduction	<i>trivial</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publishable</i>
Literature coverage	<i>very shallow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>extensive and deep</i>
Description of aims	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>perfectly clear</i>
Materials and methods	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>perfectly clear</i>
Description of results	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>perfectly clear</i>
Figures/legends/tables	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>perfectly clear, complete</i>
Quality of data	<i>poor</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>new and publishable</i>
Analysis of data	<i>very shallow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>full stats, etc</i>
Discussion	<i>very shallow</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>publication standard</i>
References	<i>wholly inadequate</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>fully accurate</i>
Understanding/insight	<i>very little</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>research level</i>
Scientific rigor	<i>weak</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>strict</i>
Originality of expression	<i>derivative</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>innovative/highly original</i>
Good points			
What, if anything, was misunderstood or omitted?			
Mark & initials:			

Please Turn Over for assessment of laboratory performance

Lab/field-work performance

How diligently did the student work?	<i>indolently</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>intensively</i>
How well did the student plan/design the experiments	<i>slapdash</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>research level</i>
How well were the experimental methods and results documented (e.g. in lab book)?	<i>slapdash</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>research level</i>
How well did the student observe the relevant safety procedures (e.g. wear lab coat)?	<i>never</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>always</i>
How accurate was the student's experimental technique?	<i>slapdash</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>research level</i>
How well did the student interpret the data?	<i>poorly</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>research level</i>
Quantity of work done	<i>very little</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>A great deal</i>
Comments			
Mark & initials:			

Final year *Literature Project Lay Summary for Science Communication*: assessment criteria

A 300 word synopsis of the final year literature report which is written for the adult general public (presumed to a broadsheet newspaper reader with a basic grasp of science).

Class	%	Criteria
1st	100	The summary is audience-appropriate and gives a masterful synopsis of the literature report , showing total command of the most salient concepts and facts to be put across and is written in clear, engaging prose.
	95	
	90	
	85	
	80	The summary meets all the requirements describe above but shows very minor deficiencies in one aspect.
	76	
	72	
2A	68	The summary gives a well-organised and audience-appropriate synopsis of the literature report . It demonstrates a mostly accurate account of the most salient concepts and facts to be put across and is written in clear prose. It lacks significant errors of understanding .
	65	
	62	
2B	58	The summary delivers a largely accurate synopsis of the literature report or, while accurate, is written in a style that is not completely suited to the target audience, or is marred by defective organisation, omissions or errors that indicate a lack of clear understanding of the purpose of the lay summary.
	55	
	52	
3rd	48	The summary is not audience-appropriate in style or is poorly organised or fails to highlight the salient concepts and facts from the literature report.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	The summary is not audience-appropriate and fails to include the salient points of the literature report. It lacks clarity and is marred by major errors, brevity, and/or irrelevance.
	35	
	30	
	25	The summary is too inaccurate, irrelevant, or brief to indicate more than a vague understanding of the topic or of the audience.
	20	
	15	The summary presents less than three relevant sentences and is too inaccurate, irrelevant, or brief to indicate more than a vague understanding of the topic or of the audience.
	10	
	5	
0	The article contains nothing that is both correct and relevant to the literature report. Mark given where the work presented is discovered not to be that of the candidate (plagiarised).	

Final year *Literature Project Lay Summary for Science Communication*: report

Stick your name label over this text		<p>Plagiarism is cheating. Plagiarism is the use of someone else's work without proper acknowledgement, presenting it as your own. Any plagiarism discovered in this work will result in a penalty, varying from deduction of marks to more serious disciplinary action, according to the severity of the offence. By submitting this form with your article, you are declaring that your contribution to the article is free from plagiarism as defined by the college policy: http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/registry/exams/examoffences</p>	
Marker:		Article: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/	
(Office use only) Work should be returned by:			
<p>Complete, gives sufficient relevant information disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree (Main omissions given below)</p>	<p>Accurate, containing no significant errors disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree (Main errors given below)</p>	<p>Written in good and concise English disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree</p>	<p>Pitched appropriately to expected audience(s) disagree <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> agree</p>
<p>Good points</p> 			
<p>What, if anything, was omitted from the content, or poorly implemented?</p> 			
First mark & marker's initials	Second mark & marker's initials	Agreed mark:	
Explanation of agreed mark			

Year in Industry placement account: assessment criteria

Allowances will be made for whether the student was in the second or third year of the degree programme when the placement was completed and whether the placement was for a period of six months or a year.

Class	%	Criteria
1st	100	Placement account shows that the student has taken full advantage of all training opportunities offered by the employing institution, has undertaken independent initiatives to obtain further training or scientific work during the placement, and can communicate scientific information about work carried out during the placement in a consistently engaging style appropriate to the nature of the work and the information obtained.
	95	
	90	
	85	Placement account meets all of the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as fully meeting two of the criteria for a mark of 90+ or partially meeting all three.
	80	
	76	Placement account meets all of the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as fully meeting one of the criteria for a mark of 90+ or partially meeting two.
72		
2A	68	Placement account shows that the student has completed the programme of scientific work allocated to them by the employing institution, acquired the skills and experience appropriate to that work , and has provided a clear, structured and scientific account of the work carried out during the placement, in an appropriate style. <i>N.B. Placement accounts must be written concisely with appropriate and basically correct use of references to attain a 2A mark or higher</i>
	65	
	62	
2B	58	Placement account shows that the student has at least very nearly completed the programme of scientific work allocated to them by the employing institution, acquired most of the skills and experience appropriate to the work, and has provided a clear account of the work carried out during the placement, written in an appropriate style. <i>N.B. Placement accounts that are too long, poorly written, and/or that show inappropriate and/or incorrect use of references are unlikely to be marked above a 2B.</i>
	55	
	52	
3rd	48	Placement account shows that the student has completed satisfactorily most of the programme of scientific work allocated to them by the employing institution (circumstances outside the student's control should be taken account) has acquired some of the scientific, organisational or other relevant skills and experience during the placement, and has provided a basic if flawed account of the work carried out during the placement.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Placement account contains less than a third of the expected relevant material about the placement, shows no more than a slight understanding of the scientific background, shows that some but not most of the programme of scientific work was completed satisfactorily (circumstances outside the student's control should be taken into account), and does not demonstrate the acquisition of relevant skills.
	35	
	30	
	25	Placement account contains less than a quarter of the expected relevant material about the placement, and shows very little or no understanding of the scientific background.
	20	
	15	Placement account contains only a few relevant sentences about the placement.
	10	
	5	
0	No placement account was submitted, or the account contains nothing relevant to the work carried out during the placement.	

Year in Europe cultural report: assessment criteria

The cultural report is on a specific topic related to any aspect of the cultural life (social, artistic, political, economic) of the country or region the student is in.

Class	%	Criteria
1st	100	Cultural report is of publishable quality , and is written in the style of an authoritative article in a 'quality' newspaper or magazine (e.g. <i>The Times, Guardian, Economist</i>).
	95	Cultural report is a comprehensive survey of the relevant literature , with thoughtful selection of relevant material (at least some of which is primary) and consistent attention to detail (in references, figures, etc.). The cultural report demonstrates a consistently analytical* or critical* treatment of the information and independently synthesises a structured argument .
	90	
	85	Cultural report meets all of the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as most of the criteria for a mark of 90+ .
	80	
	76	Cultural report meets all of the criteria for a mark of 68 as well as one or a few criteria for a mark of 90+ .
	72	
2A	68	Cultural report is a very good exposition of the subject , showing the following attributes: (i) logical structure ; (ii) appropriate writing style ; (iii) disciplined exploration and use of literature sources ; and (iv) some critical*, analytical* or synthetic* treatment of the information.
	65	
	62	<i>N.B. Cultural reports must be written concisely with appropriate and basically correct use of references to attain a 2A mark or higher</i>
2B	58	Cultural report gives a largely complete account of the subject area , showing at least limited understanding of most of the material . Reports in this bracket are likely to show evidence of extensive reliance on non-primary sources (e.g. books, magazines, newspapers), and of lack of insight into or failure to comprehend parts of the subject matter.
	55	
	52	<i>N.B. Cultural reports that are too long, poorly written, and/or that show inappropriate and/or incorrect acknowledgement of sources are unlikely to be marked above a 2B.</i>
3rd	48	Cultural report is acceptable, with more than half of the expected amount of content , but does not identify and use sufficient relevant source material, and/or presents them in an inconsistent, incomplete or imprecise way. Reports in this bracket are likely to lack clear structure, to be written in an inappropriate style, and to be marred by significant errors.
	45	
	42	
Fail	38	Cultural report has less than half of the expected amount of content and shows little understanding of the literature. Reports in this bracket or below are likely to have been carelessly produced and poorly referenced.
	35	
	30	
	25	Cultural report contains more than a few correct relevant sentences , but is unacceptably brief, shows very little understanding of the literature and is very poorly referenced.
	20	
	15	Cultural report contains only a few correct relevant sentences .
	10	
	5	
0	Cultural report not submitted or contains nothing correct that is of relevance to the subject.	

Footnotes: Analytical = breaking a concept down into its parts and examining their inter-relationships, e.g. comparing and contrasting two models. *Critical* = judging a hypothesis or conclusion by examining the validity of the evidence presented for it, e.g. evaluating two competing models. *Synthetic* = integrating concepts from several sources. e.g. discussing relevant outside reading, or combining material across several lectures or courses into a coherent or original whole.