

Marking criteria for BIA4 ICA 2 - individual report

A (90-100%)

Excellent submissions

- Clear and well-written piece of work
- Clearly introduces the biomedical context for the problem chosen for the group work.
- The report shows good evidence of critical appraisal of the literature on the subject
- Show evidence of how the work could be improved, with a strong support from the current literature on the topic.
- Show clear evidence of reflection both for the student's individual contribution and for how the group worked together.

These are exceptional pieces of work, which would be of almost-publishable quality.

Exceptional submissions (over 95%) show all of the above, and

- Show exceptional understanding of the problem and its context.
- Show exceptional critical appraisal of the literature on the subject.

These will be highly unusual and exceptional pieces of work, which would be expected to be of publishable quality.

B (80-89%)

Very good submissions

- Well-written piece of work
- Introduces the biomedical context for the problem chosen for the group work, with only minimal stylistic or factual errors.
- There is some evidence of critical appraisal of the literature on the subject.
- There is some evidence for reflection on both the student's individual contribution and how the group worked together.
- There is some critical evaluation of how the work could be improved, with limited support from the current literature on the topic.

C (70-79%)

Good submissions

- The report introduces the biomedical context for the problem chosen for the group work
- There might be some factual errors
- English can be improved
- There is limited evidence of critical appraisal of the literature on the subject
- There are some suggestions on how the work could be improved, with limited support from the current literature on the topic

- Reflection on the group work is limited to either the student's individual contribution or how the group worked together and does not go into much depth

D (60-69%)

Satisfactory submissions

- The report introduces the biomedical context for the problem chosen for the group work
- This introduction contains several factual errors and it is not clearly written.
- There is very limited evidence of critical appraisal of the literature on the subject.
- There are some suggestions on how the work could be improved, with little to no support from the current literature on the topic.
- Critical reflection on the group work is extremely limited.

E (30-59%)

Poor submissions

- The report contains a large number of factual errors and does not clearly introduce the biomedical context for the problem chosen for the group work.
- There is extremely limited evidence of critical appraisal of the literature on the subject.
- There are very few suggestions on how the work could be improved, with no support from the current literature on the topic.
- Critical reflection on the group work is poor.

F (0-29%)

Very poor submissions

- The report is difficult to understand, and shows no support from the current literature.
- There is hardly any reflection on the group work.
- There are no suggestions for future work.