

I.V Qualitative Criteria for Judgmental Assessment of Level 1 Practical Reports

GRADE	COMMENT	SUMMARY & INTRO	METHODS	RESULTS	DISCUSSION & REFERENCES
80 – 100	An outstanding report. A whole class above a normal first.	Concise and well written. No errors or omissions.	Concise and accurate description. No detectable errors.	Presentation, description and analysis of results are of a very high standard.	Outstanding depth and breadth. Able to explain complex ideas and state how they relate to current work. Suggestions for novel and valid experiments. Complete referencing/reference list.
70 – 79	Excellent presentation with good command of English, IT skills and appropriate literature. No significant errors or omissions. Follows house style.	Summary gives aim, key findings (qualitative & quantitative) and conclusions in clear coherent manner, supported by evidence. Introduction covers all major areas of background, is well written & with definitive aim.	Complete, accurate and logical description of methods, with no trivial details. Clear outline of appropriate numeric and statistical methods.	Lucid & accurate description / presentation of results. Figures & tables are correct, with concise legends & complement text. Accurate use of numeric & statistical methods.	Clear, coherent discussion. Able to discuss the significance of results and provide a sound critique. Good ideas for development of work. Displays a good command of literature. Accurate referencing/reference list.
60 – 69	Good all-round account. Sufficient work to indicate the candidate has a sound knowledge and understanding of the project. Few errors/omissions and closely follows house style.	Summary states aim, important findings and conclusions. Some quantitative information given. Introduction is logical with a good description of literature and clear aim.	Accurate description of methods. Few minor omissions and/or trivial detail. Appropriate choice of numeric and statistical methods.	Sound description & presentation of results with clear reference to figures. Figures & tables largely correct. Appropriate use of numeric & statistical methods.	Good coherence, appreciates the significance of results, moderate critical analysis. Clear awareness of experimental limitations. Some ideas for development of work. Sound grasp of relevant literature. Few errors in referencing/reference list.
50 – 59	Clear evidence the candidate has a reasonable knowledge and understanding of the project. May contain some errors or omissions. Mostly in house style.	Sound summary but may lack quantitative information. Introduction gives an adequate description of background and statement of aim.	Competent description of the important experimental methods. May contain some errors/omissions, trivial detail and a superficial description of numeric/statistical methods.	Mostly clear and accurate description and presentation of results with good links to figures. Some errors in figures and tables and/or application of statistics/numeric methods or limited use of the latter.	Coherent and competent assessment of results with some critical analysis. May be some repetition of results and few clear ideas for development of work. Adequate citations and referencing.
41 - 49	Sufficient work to indicate the candidate has the minimum acceptable knowledge and understanding of the project. May exhibit poor editing and lapses of house style.	May lack clarity and coherence. Summary may contain little quantitative information and conclusions may not be supported by findings. Introduction contains a weak literature review and/or poor statement of aim.	Weak description of methods. Poor logic/ significant omissions and/or much trivial detail. Little description of numeric/statistical methods.	Superficial or inaccurate description & presentation of results. Figures & tables contain frequent errors. Limited links between figures/tables & text, may also be duplication. Poor use of numeric & statistical methods.	Much repetition of results with little assessment of them. Few or no ideas for development of work. Limited use of literature with little critical analysis. Frequent errors in referencing text and reference list.
Pass	Sufficient work to reach	minimum acceptable standard			
Fail (20 – 39)	Poor report. Clear evidence of a lack of understanding and/or application in laboratory. Significant errors/ omissions/ numerous lapses in house style.	Poor clarity and coherence. Significant omissions from summary or introduction. Introduction is a superficial review of literature with vague or no statement of aim.	Superficial and many mistakes. Difficult to understand how experiments and analysis of results have been done.	Incomplete and/or inaccurate description and presentation of results. Figures and tables absent, incorrect or not linked to text. Little use of numeric & statistical methods.	Much repetition of results with little assessment of them. Few or no ideas for development of work. Poor use of literature, no critical analysis and many errors in referencing text/reference list.
Bad fail (0 – 19)	Inadequate write-up. Much evidence of a lack of understanding and/or application. Many errors/ omissions and may not have used house style.	Rudimentary attempt. May be no Summary and/or little evidence in the Introduction of engagement with literature. No aim. Badly written.	Unable to repeat experiments from the information given and/or methods of analysis of the results is incomprehensible.	Poor description and presentation of results. Figures and tables absent or totally inadequate. Figures may be present with no text. No significant use of numeric/ statistical methods.	No serious attempt to discuss the significance of the results. Insufficient use of literature, little or no referencing of text and scant reference list with errors.

