Evaluation area	Excellent (70–75) / Outstanding (76–85) / Exemplary (86–100)	Good (60–64) / Very good (65–69)	Sound (50–59)	Acceptable (40–49)	Insufficient (< 40)
Knowledge and Understanding (25%)	Compelling rationale and incisive research question. Demonstrated mastery of course concepts, integrating and synthesising learning over and above in-class material. Excellent knowledge adds breadth and depth to introduction, analysis and discussion, with no factual errors.	(Clear) rationale for and comprehension of research question. (Very) good knowledge clearly apparent and used to develop scientific argument. Course concepts understood; learning from across the module integrated and synthesised with no major factual errors.	Introduction provides some context for research. Analysis, interpretation and discussion place results in context of course concepts. Some evidence of sound (if limited) knowledge, with few significant factual errors.	Significantly restricted context for research; limited attempt to interpret results or link to wider concepts. Acceptable level of knowledge only implicitly demonstrated, with factual errors or misunderstandings.	Research objectives misunderstood. No demonstrable understanding of results' meaning or significance. Frequent or fundamental errors.
Analysis (25%)	Use of sophisticated methods, with account of how they explicitly address research question. Lucid, concise, precise and explicit exposition of methods. Detailed evaluation of strengths, bias and weaknesses in data and analyses.	Analyses appropriate and linked to research question, with rationale for use. Clear and complete description of methods, in just enough detail to reproduce experiment. Some consideration of limitations and biases inherent in data and analyses.	Most analyses justified or linked to research question. Methods described sufficiently to attempt repeat of experiment, with few irrelevant details. Details, such as how to quantify species, missing. Occasional errors in analyses.	Limited or inappropriate range of analytical techniques employed without justification. Significant omissions or errors in description of methodology. Prominent errors in analyses.	Choice of method unjustifiable, or justification in error. Not clear how research was conducted. Analyses unsuitable, incomplete or fundamentally flawed.
Presentation and Evaluation of Results (40%)	Relevant data clearly, effectively and unambiguously presented; key implications immediately obvious. All data further the scientific discussion, with thoughtful interpretation; new insights identified and set in context of wider literature. Appropriate breadth and depth of literature used and cited appropriately; concepts and information from relevant sources critically evaluated to illuminate and develop discussion.	Relevant data clearly presented, emphasizing relevant aspects of data, with limited irrelevant material. Most data interpreted and applied to research question, with some appreciation of wider significance, and reference to concepts from representative literature. Most statements linked to a result or a primary source.	Necessary data documented in an appropriate graphical or tabular format; some irrelevant data over-emphasized. Results and some additional literature applied to research question, with significance discussed. Citation practice generally sound; many statements supported by research findings or literature citations.	Data limited, incomplete, or largely irrelevant; signal obscured by unsuitable format (e.g. graph, table). Acceptable but significantly restricted evaluation of research findings. Limited or unrepresentative use of primary literature. Data difficult to reconcile with discussion.	Data presented irrelevant to report, or does not correspond to data recorded in lab notebook. Research findings not meaningfully discussed. Few statements supported by research findings or literature sources.
Style and Structure (10%)	Mature, engaging and lucid prose; impeccable spelling, punctuation and grammar; scientific terminology used appropriately; correct capitalization and italicization of taxonomic terms; perfect adherence to formatting requirements. Coherent narrative throughout all sections of report, with no irrelevant material, developing strong argument leading to clear conclusion.	Clear and concise prose; few errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar or formatting; minimal waffle; scientific voice used throughout; statements not over-qualified. Consistent citation and reference format. Focussed narrative with few tangents, developing clear argument tied to research question.	Prose legible and generally precise; linguistic errors do not obscure meaning; tone seldom informal or inappropriate. Fair attempt to follow formatting requirements. Some evidence of overall theme or purpose. Most sections, paragraphs and sentences broadly coherent. Results and interpretations clearly separated.	Difficult to follow without careful reading; impossible to skim. Some phrases ambiguous or misleading; terminology used inappropriately. Sections or paragraphs unconnected. Few clear narrative threads or arguments; many irrelevant tangents.	Incoherent; difficult to follow / comprehend. Inappropriate tone, language and formatting; inadequately anonymised. Results intermingled with interpretation and discussion; sections absent.
Wenlock Report Overall grade */ 100*					