Practical report marking criteria

Marked in accordance with the Senate Scale.

Please note that categories ('*Title*', '*Materials and methods*' etc.) are not equally weighted and weighting may vary from one assignment to another.

	Poor (<40)	Satisfactory (40s)	Fair (50s)	Good (60s)	Very good (70s)	Excellent (80+)
Title		Absent or vague.	Too long, but does have some of the right detail	Concise, but some detail is missing	Clear and concise with required detail	
Introduction	Very short with no citations. Poor and/or muddled content.	Confused with poor structure. Few or no citations. The science is not clear and has major errors. No aim at the end or the aim is not clear. Incorrect information such as methods or expectations of results.	Some good information but the structure is poor. Science is muddled in places. Includes details that belong in the methods. Too few citations. Citations are not appropriate (e.g. websites). The aim is stated, but not clear. Aim isn't at the end.	Good information, but the structure weak in places. The science has some minor errors. A good level of correct citation, but not extensive. A good aim at the end, but it might lack some clarity.	Correct structure, excellent background information. The science is clear and well explained. Good citation of primary and or/book references. Clear and complete aim at the end.	Correct structure, excellent background information. Science is clear and well explained. Good citation of primary and/or book references. Thorough understanding of the primary literature included. Clear and complete aim at the end.
Materials and methods	Information presented as lists and unstructured instructions. Hard to follow. Important information missing.	Method is written in the present tense or first person throughout. Contains a lot of unnecessary information. Scientific units and symbols are not accurate or consistent. It is very confused. Paragraph structure absent. Use of lists. No mention of data handling.	Method is a mix of present and past tense, and quite a bit is also written in the first person. There is some unnecessary information. Sentences start with numbers. Scientific units and symbols not always used correctly. Weak paragraph structure. Weak or no reference to what was done with the data.	Method is in the past tense and mostly written in the passive voice. Appropriate units and symbols used. There is a little unnecessary information. Some sentences begin with numbers. The method is well structured but might lack some clarity in places. There is a section about what was done with the data.	Method is in the past tense and passive voice. It is clear and concise and does not contain unnecessary information. Appropriate units and symbols used. Sentences do not begin with numbers. The method has been well structured, and it is easy to follow. There is a section clearly stating what was done with the data.	All of 70s category but with sophisticated scientific language.

| Results | Weak, inappropriate presentation of raw data.

No description of results.

No attempt at presenting any statistics. | Tables and figures without title, context or descriptive text. Raw data are presented. Stats output tables are included when they shouldn't be. Description is weak, or simply a repetition of the data. Little understanding of the statistics presented. | Data are presented. Results have little or no context. Tables and figures have titles but are incorrectly placed. The results are described clearly, but there with some confusion. Incomplete or absent reference to any table or figure. Stats presented but poorly described. | The data are well presented. The results have some context, but it lacks detail. Tables/figures have titles but are incorrectly placed. The results are described clearly with some reference to the figures/tables. Science has been well understood. Stats: focus is more on the values than the biology. | Very well-presented data. The results have detailed context. The table(s) have titles. The results are described clearly and concisely referring to figures/tables correctly. Science has been well understood. Stats: the description focuses on the biology. | Tables/figures presented to a very high standard.

Description focuses completely on the biology. Where stats required, there is excellent focus on the biology. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Discussion | There is no interpretation of the results.

Only very basic comments on the experiment. | The discussion of the data is very brief, or it is confused and lacking in detail. The results are misinterpreted. No reference to other published data. | The data have been discussed but there is no/limited reference to other published data. There is some misinterpretation of the data. The science has been quite well explained but it lacks detail. There is some confusion. Very few citations of primary literature, reviews or text books. | The data have been quite well interpreted and discussed to a good standard, and there is some reference to other published data. The science has been well explained with a good level of detail. There may be some lack of clarity. Good citation of primary literature, reviews and text books. | The data have been correctly interpreted and discussed to a high standard. All suggestions backed up with evidence from the literature. The science has been well explained and has an excellent level of detail. Very good citation of primary literature, reviews and text books. | As 70s with more sophisticated analysis and use of more sophisticated scientific language. |
| References | There are no references. | There are few references and citations. Incorrect (non-Harvard) formatting has been used. | References missing from reference list. The Harvard style has been followed, but there is some lack of consistency. | Most references are correctly cited in the text. The references are in the Harvard style and have a consistent format. | All references are correctly cited in the text. The references are in the Harvard style and have a consistent format. | As 70s category, with no errors. |
| Overall Scientific writing | Poor sentence construction. Poor use of specific names, symbols or | Much of the writing is poor – wrong tenses used, sentences rambling and | Some of the writing is poor – wrong tenses used, sentences rambling and | Not all the writing is in the correct tense and voice. Most Latin genus and | All the writing is in the correct tense and passive voice where appropriate. All Latin | As 70s category plus the writing is sophisticated, |

	units. Writing is confusing and difficult to understand.	unfocused. Latin genus and species names are incorrect. Incorrect use of scientific units and symbols. There is a lot of colloquial language.	unfocused. Latin genus and species names are not italicised or correctly abbreviated. Scientific units and symbols are mostly correct. Some use of colloquial language.	species names are italicised and abbreviated correctly. All correct scientific units and symbols are used. The writing is good, but there is some use of colloquial language.	genus and species names are italicised and abbreviated correctly. All correct scientific units and symbols are used. There is no use of colloquial language.	focused and in a concise style. There are no errors in the reference to genus, species, units or symbols.
Comments						