Criteria for Grades Awarded to Project Performance

Class	Laboratory	e-Learning	Education
I	Highly motivated and well-organised student, who only occasionally needs advice or guidance; able to design own experiments; clearly shows initiative and ability to work independently; combines manual dexterity with careful logical approach to new techniques; reliable results; will make an excellent research worker.	Highly motivated and well-organised student, who only occasionally needs advice or guidance; able to design own investigations, resources and evaluation; clearly shows initiative, ability to work independently and a careful logical approach; skilful and shows clarity of ideas. Participates fully in online discussions and demonstrates critical evaluation in peer review.	Highly motivated and well-organised student, who only occasionally needs advice or guidance; able to design own resources and evaluation; clearly shows initiative, ability to work independently and a careful logical approach; excellent interaction with the school/teacher.
95-100%	Shows all of the above attributes.		
85-90%	Shows most of the above attributes.		
70-80%	Shows many of the above attributes.		
II(i) 60-65%	Good student, needing some advice, but generally carries out work skilfully and accurately; reliable results; shows strong signs that could be a good research worker.	Good student, needing some advice, but generally carries out work logically and competently. e-Learning – participates regularly in online discussions and peer review.	
II(ii) 50-55%	Average student, needing regular advice; generally adequate technique/skills, with some mistakes; planning of work and use of time not well organized; mainly follows directions. e-Learning – makes some contributions to online discussions and peer review.		
III 40-45%	Below-average student, needing regular advice and not always putting this into practice; with obvious deficiencies in technique and application.	Below-average student, needing regular advice and not always putting this into practice; with obvious deficiencies in technique and application. Poor use of online discussion forums.	Below-average student, needing regular advice and not always putting this into practice; with obvious deficiencies in technique and application. Poor interaction with instructor.
Fail 35%	Poor student, with little commitment; attendance unreliable; has difficulty following instructions; data inaccurate, suspect, or scanty.	Poor student, with little commitment; attendance unreliable; has difficulty following instructions. e-Learning: does not engage with the peer review process.	
Fail 0-30%	Very poor student; lacks motivation, and fails to respond to encouragement; very poor worker, who has little skill and no respect for apparatus; attendance unreliable; misses appointments; data lacking or unreliable; cannot follow simple instructions.	Very poor student; lacks motivation, and fails to respond to encouragement; very poor worker who has little skill; attendance unreliable; misses appointments; online materials inadequate or incomplete; cannot follow simple instructions. No contributions to peer review.	Very poor student; lacks motivation, and fails to respond to encouragement; very poor worker; attendance unreliable; misses appointments; data lacking or unreliable; cannot follow simple instructions.

Assessment of Educational Project Resource: *Session: 2007-2008*

Student name…………………………………………… ID…………..

Project title………………………………………………………………

Criteria	Fail	Pass	III	II/ii	II/i	I
Organisation/preparation of activity (if applicable e.g. for school workshop)						
Delivery (if appropriate)						
Teacher/tutor notes						
Resource user worksheets (e.g. pupil handouts)						
Scientific content						
Resource reusability						
Overall supervisor evaluation of resource						

Notes for supervisors and second markers:

Not all categories will be applicable to all projects.

Organisation/preparation of activity (if applicable e.g. for school workshop)	How well has the student organised the workshop/teaching activity? – this could include liaising with the school, booking coaches, pre-empting problems before they happen, trouble-shooting etc
Delivery (if appropriate)	Did the student deliver the workshop or explain the tasks to the audience themselves?
Teacher/tutor notes	Were these useful, accurate and to a sufficient depth?
Resource user worksheets, handouts or the resource itself	Were these prepared to an adequate standard and presented appropriately
Scientific content	This covers the accuracy of the science, how current & up-to-date and the appropriate depth
Resource reusability	Could the resource be used for future years with little/no amendment?
Overall supervisor evaluation of resource	How satisfied were you with the resource?

Criteria for Grades Awarded to Project Reports

Class	Laboratory	e-Learning	Education
I	Well organised; clear English; shows excellent knowledge of research area; methods clearly presented; data appropriately presented with statistical analysis; good interpretation of data; critical discussion; well referenced.		Well organised; clear English; shows excellent knowledge of area; logical approach to the problem; methods clearly presented; feedback data appropriately presented with statistical analysis where appropriate; good interpretation of data; critical discussion; well referenced.
95-100%	Report shows all the above criteria and is of publishable[1] quality with little/no modification. A mark of 100% is permissible and may be awarded for a report which equals or surpasses that which might be written by the students supervisor or an expert in the relevant field.		
85, 90%	Report shows most of the above criteria and is of publishable quality with a few modifications.		
70-80%	Report shows many of the above criteria and approaches publishable quality.		
II(i) 60, 65%	Good organisation and clear English; shows good knowledge of area; methods fully presented; data generally well presented with appropriate statistical analysis although possibly some deficiencies; data interpreted and discussed; generally referenced.		
II(ii) 50,55%	Adequate report; basic superficial knowledge of area but with gaps; methods presented but may lack clarity; data presented with lack of adequate analysis; incomplete interpretation; little attempt to relate to published work; referencing sketchy.		
III 40,45%	Poor report; little knowledge of area; methods inadequately presented; some data but without adequate analysis or interpretation; no attempt to relate to published work; poor referencing.		
Fail 35%	Badly written report; shows virtually no knowledge of area; methods poorly presented; little analysis of data, which is sketchy; many inaccuracies; no attempt to discuss significance; very poor referencing.		
Fail 0-30%	Very bad report; no obvious knowledge of research area; methods not presented; data (if any) badly presented; no analysis or interpretation; no discussion; little referencing. A mark of zero is permissible to indicate work of no merit.		

N.B. If, **for reasons beyond your control**, projects fail to give adequate results, or the product is not completely finished/tested, you will not be penalised or disadvantaged.

---

[1] In the case of e-Learning or Education projects, "publishable" means could be immediately deployed as an educational resource.