Submission Marking Criteria (BIO00052M)

The submission will be marked out of 100 using the following marking scheme.

Word Count: There is no strict word limit for this assessment but the submission should be sufficiently and concisely annotated. We recommend no more than six figures to describe the results.

Mark weighting by section: Marks will be awarded for appropriate and accurate use of statistics (40% of the marks), for appropriate figures with descriptive captions (30% of the marks), and for accurate, well annotated R code provided as part of a zipped R project (30% of the marks).

Marks can fall between these bands, the requirements for each band are given in more detail beneath.

Outstanding (80-100): An excellent submission. Very well presented and succinctly written. Excellent use of non default design elements in figures and very clear code annotation.
Excellent (72-78): Very good submission. Well presented figures and text with non default design elements.
Good (62-68): Good submission. Easy to read and logically presented.
Satisfactory (52-58): Reasonable submission
Weak (42-48): Weak, very short or large quantity of low quality results
Compensatable Fail (30 - 38): Inadequate submission, rationale unclear, results lacking. Substantial misunderstanding and poor presentation.
Outright Fail (0-25): Very poor, short or completely inappropriate. No useful results or understanding. No useful figures/tables

Stepped marking criteria for projects

Mark (%)	Statistics	Figures	R code	Overall
100 **95** **90** **85** **80**	**Data thoroughly analysed using accurate, correctly applied** and **appropriately justified** statistics. Only the correct elements of the output used **(and nothing more) where needed.**	**Exceptionally high quality presentation**. Figures are at/near **publication standard**. Only appropriate figures with **very clear captions** that are **easy to understand as 'stand-alone' items**. Excellent use of legends, axis labels, and other design elements. **s.**	**Working code to produce all statistics,** figures and summaries used in the submission. **Excellent annotation**s within the code.	**Outstanding:** Excellent. **Very well presented and succinctly written**. Excellent use of non default design elements in figures and very clear code annotation. **100: No room for improvement.** Text and figures are publication quality. States the key findings concisely and clearly **95,90: Minor room for improvement:** Almost publication quality figures. Clear understanding of the analyses performed. **Complete and concise annotations** with **appropriate level of detail**. **85,80:** Good understanding of the analyses demonstrated in text. Figures make use of **lots of non default design elements** such as themes and plot annotations. May still include some minor unnecessary detail in text. **Code is well annotated** but may contain too much detail.

Mark (%)	Statistics	Figures	R code	Overall
78 **75** **72**	**Correctly applied and appropriately justified** with the **correct elements of the output** used where needed. **May include some extra information** that is not required.	**Very clear figures with good captions** that work as ‘stand-alone’ items. **Clear consideration of the various design elements**.	**Working code to produce all statistics, figures and summaries used in the submission**, although **some extra tests may be included that are not used**. **Clear annotations** within the code. Code is well laid out and easy to follow however there may be **style inconsistencies** in the use of **space/readability** of code.	**Excellent:** **Very good. Well presented** figures and text with **non default design elements**. 78: **Well presented** and effective use of statistics. **Code annotation text focuses on key results**. **Code and submission is well structured** in an easy to read layout 75: Well presented but **code may contain some inconsistencies in use of white space** or have additional spaces around functions. 72: Well presented, however **code layout may have less style consistency**. **Key findings stated**, but additional extra details about these findings presented.

Mark (%)	Statistics	Figures	R code	Overall
68 **65** **62**	**Nearly all statistics correctly applied and justified** using the R output where needed. There **may be some information missing or lots of extra information** that is not required (e.g. complete default output from R).	**Sufficient figures with captions** that can be mostly understood as 'stand-alone' items. **Maybe lots of default design elements** or some inappropriate figure style.	**Mostly working code to produce all statistics, figures and summaries**, although there may be some problems with running code. **Could be R code for alternative tests and figure drawing included that are not used in the text**. **Some annotations** within the code. **Organisation of code and folder structure of submission is appropriate** with **correct usage of Rproject** and **data file included in a sensible format**.	**Good:** **Good. Easy to read and logically presented.** **68:** Good narrative text. Figures clear but **may contain default themes** and no annotations. **Good code organisation** and correct usage of Rproject. **File/variable names meaningfully named.** **65:** Figures clear but **may have superfluous code/**may be included in the quarto document more than once. **62: Files mainly organised appropriately but could contain unnecessary/nested folders**. Reasonable interpretation of the results however the **results may not be fully interpreted.**

Mark (%)	Statistics	Figures	R code	Overall
58 **55** **52**	**Some inappropriate statistical analysis applied, or appropriate analysis not sufficiently justified.** May be **chunks of information missing** or lots of extra information that is not required (e.g. complete default output from R).	Figures reasonable but **captions not sufficient** to act as 'stand-alone' items. **Not a good match of data to figures** used. Maybe figures don't match the text or statistics applied. **Missing information (such as axis labels).**	**Code not sufficiently annotated** to produce all statistics, figures and summaries used without editing or may be several problems with running code. **Could have lots of alternative tests and figure drawing included that are explained.** Few good annotations within the code or lots of inappropriate annotations.	**Satisfactory:** Reasonable **code and layout/readability** will impact where the mark falls within this band. **58**: **Code annotations exist, but will be quite limited**. Figure formatting could be improved. **Additional figures may be presented that are unnecessary**. Some misunderstandings of statistical tests/R **55**: **Inconsistent/unintuitive variable naming** and layout of code is difficult to follow. may have lots of long run on lines of code. **52**: Some **misunderstanding of some statistical tests**/justification or the outputs

Mark (%)	Statistics	Figures	R code	Overall
48 **45** **42**	**Lots of inappropriate statistical analysis** applied and lack of justification for what has been done. May be **large chunks of information missing or lots of extra information** that is not required (e.g. complete default output from R).	Figures present but **captions missing** or definitely not sufficient to act as 'stand-alone' items. **Poor match of data** to figures used. **Figures don't match the text or statistics** applied. **Lots of missing information** (such as axis labels).	**Code not annotated** and **unable to produce statistics**, figures and summaries used in the text. **Many problems with running code.** Few annotations within the code or lots of **completely inappropriate annotations.**	**Weak:** Weak, very short or large quantity of **low quality results.** Degree of **misunderstanding** of statistical analysis or degree to how well the figures match the data will determine which mark within this range. Both text and code layout is **difficult to read.** **48**: May be able to run the code, but the methods used indicate **misunderstanding.** Several elements of the submission such as the dataset to read in may be **missing.** **45**: Code difficult to run and figures generated may either be **poorly formatted or be poorly interpreted.** **42**: Code is **very difficult to run**, or code that runs **does not match** with the annotation/suggests misunderstanding.
38 **35** **30**	Statistics used are **inappropriate and unjustified**. Dataset is **not analysed effectively** at all.	Any **figures present missing captions** and other design elements. **Tables or figures do not match the text** or statistics applied.	**Not present** or not functional. **No annotations**	**Compensatable Fail**: Inadequate submission, rationale unclear, results lacking. **Substantial misunderstanding and poor presentation**. May contain significant errors. **38**: 1 fail indicator but other aspects indicate a 40+ mark. **35**: 1 fail indicator **30**: 1 fail indicator, and partially an addition fail indicator

Mark (%)	Statistics	Figures	R code	Overall
25 **15** **8** **0**	Very poor, extremely short, or completely inappropriate. No useful results obtained. No understanding demonstrated. No useful figures or tables.			**Outright Fail:** Very poor, short or completely inappropriate. No useful results or understanding. No useful figures/tables **25**: 2 fail indicators **15**: 3 fail indicators **8**: All fail indicators **0**: No submission or an outline with very little content.
	Fail indicators **F1:** Fails to demonstrate an ability to generate/ test a hypothesis. **F2:** Generates very inappropriate figures. **F3:** Fails to generate and/or describe any results. **F4:** Exceptionally poorly written and presented.			