**Assessment Criteria.** *These elements are not necessarily given equal weight in the overall assessment.*

*(Marker: please highlight relevant comments.)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Elements** | **Top distinction**  **>80%** | **Distinction**  **70%-79%** | **Merit**  **60%-69%** | **Pass**  **50%-59%** | **Fail**  **<50%** | **Low fail**  **<40%** |
| **Completeness** | All sections completed. | All sections completed. | Almost all sections completed. | Most sections completed | Some sections not completed. | Many / most sections not completed. |
| **Quality of answers.** | All the info. required.  All accurate, relevant and concise. | All important material, concise, few minor errors. | Considerable content.  Minor errors, some irrelevant material. | Reasonable info. content.  Minor and some major errors. Some irrelevant material. | Limited answers, and/or many major errors, not concise, some waffle. | Little or no valid info.  Many errors, most material irrelevant and/or waffle. |
| **Results.**  **(as appropriate)** | Very clearly, selectively & concisely described.  Data correctly analysed & interpreted.  Tables and figures neat, accurate &, fully labeled.  Statistics correctly used, interpreted, & reported. | Clearly & concisely described.  Data correctly analysed & interpreted.  Tables and figures neat, accurate & fully labeled.  Statistics correctly used, interpreted & reported. | Mostly clearly & concisely described.  Data generally well analysed; few misinterpretations.  Some omissions / errors in presentation of tables and figures.  Statistics mainly correctly used, interpreted, & reported. | Generally clear, but difficult to identify key results.  Data analysis & interpretation satisfactory but some errors / omissions.  Significant errors in presentation of tables & figures.  Some errors in use, reporting & interpretation of statistics. | Unclear, key results not identified.  Many errors / omissions in data analysis & interpretation.  Many errors in presentation of tables & figures.  Major errors in use, reporting & interpretation of statistics. | No description of results.  Data not analysed; all key points missed or misinterpreted.  Tables and figures very poor or missing.  Statistics not used or totally inappropriate. |
| **Understanding shown** | Excellent. | Clearly evidenced. | Substantial evidence. | Some evidence. | Limited and patchy. | Little or none. |
| **Presentation/**  **Quality of writing.** | Great clarity. Very concise. Entirely logical in structure.  Negligible errors in spelling & grammar. | Clear and concise.  Generally very logical.  Minimal errors in spelling & grammar. | Usually clear and concise.  Only minor weaknesses in logic.  Few minor errors in spelling & grammar. | Some lack of clarity and not concise.  Some lapses in logic.  Some errors in spelling & grammar. | Lacks clarity, and not concise.  Frequently illogical.  Many errors in spelling & grammar. | Rambling, unclear. Difficult to understand.  Illogical.  Very many errors in spelling & grammar. |

1. **ANY ADDITIONAL MARKERS COMMENTS also SEE ANNOTATION ON YOUR WORK:**

|  |
| --- |
| An ok project and rationale. Well done for remembering to include xgal and IPTG in your plates.  You speak at a good speed but your slides often contain far too many words, this forces the audience to read a lot of information. You also just appear to be reading the information on your slides. Be careful about your images not covering up text on slides.  You don’t need to provide as much background on the methods (who invented it etc isn’t relevant). Try to be more concise. You should be apply to show you can apply your knowledge of the techniques. One way to do this would be to say what you will do once you have cloned your gene. What studies will be performed using the gene/protein?  Good references however try to make them smaller on your slides. |

1. **MARK:......66%............................ NAME OF MARKER:..............Angela Pine..................**