

## General Portfolio assessment criteria

A portfolio consists of a collection of work that relates to a given topic or theme. The marking of the portfolio may follow one of two models:

- Individual components are marked following the assessment criteria for specific pieces of work, e.g. short answers, presentation, problem set etc. The rule specifying how the overall grade is determined from these marks will be made clear by the Module Organiser, and links to the relevant criteria will be provided.
- The work is marked 'as a whole' and the single grade should relate to criteria such as these:

\* Judgement is required to modulate expectation relative to the study level of the module.

Mark/ Class	Scientific content and understanding	Data collection and processing (where relevant)	Evaluative and analytical skills (where relevant)	Structure & style
80 - 100%  1st	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows a sophisticated understanding of the key scientific principles *</li> <li>Evidence of extensive reading and research around the subject area.</li> </ol> <p><b>Throughout the portfolio</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation of data is exceptional in terms of clarity, organisation and rigour, demonstrating initiative and flair.</li> <li>Processing of raw data is insightful and purposefully pertinent to the central research question as well as the discussion of results.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conclusion and discussion show an insightful grasp of the implications of the evidence, work or reviewed literature with outstanding depth and breadth*</li> <li>Sources of error or limitations of the work are comprehensively explored. Suggests realistic, meaningful improvements and future work.</li> </ol> <p><b>Applies to all relevant parts of the portfolio.</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eloquent use of appropriate formal academic language</li> <li>Pieces of work follow a logical sequence.</li> <li>Outstandingly coherent work. Well structured, imaginative and engaging. Ideas and arguments are enhanced</li> </ol> <p><b>Throughout the portfolio</b></p>
70 - 80%  1st	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows a very good understanding of the key scientific principles *</li> <li>Evidence of extra reading and research around the subject area.</li> </ol> <p><b>Throughout the portfolio</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation of data is excellent in terms of clarity, organisation and rigour.</li> <li>Processing of raw data is purposefully pertinent to the central research question as well as the discussion of results.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States relevant conclusions, with justification, based on a reasonable interpretation of the evidence. Compares results to known theory where relevant/</li> <li>Sources of error or limitations of the work are explored. Suggests sensible improvements and future work.</li> </ol> <p><b>Applies to all relevant parts of the portfolio</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eloquent use of appropriate formal academic language</li> <li>Pieces of work follow a logical sequence, are well structured and engaging. Ideas and arguments are enhanced</li> </ol> <p><b>Throughout the portfolio</b></p>
60- 69%  2(i)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows a good understanding of the underlying scientific principles.*</li> </ol> <p><b>Throughout the portfolio</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the data presentation is clear and thorough.</li> <li>Processing of the raw data is correct, using appropriate methods.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States a relevant conclusion, with justification, based on a reasonable interpretation of the data but may be less concise than a 1<sup>st</sup> or over-speculative or rambling in places.</li> <li>Most sources of error or limitations are identified.*</li> </ol> <p><b>Applies to all relevant parts of the portfolio</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mostly clear, simple language.</li> <li>Pieces of work follow a logical sequence, are well structured and engaging.</li> </ol> <p><b>Throughout the portfolio</b></p>
50- 59%  2(ii)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shows a basic understanding of the underlying scientific principles.</li> </ol> <p><b>May be some gaps in the demonstration of understanding.</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the data presentation is clear and thorough.</li> <li>Processing of the raw data is correct, using appropriate methods.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States a relevant conclusion, with justification, based on a reasonable interpretation of the data but is weak in places or includes inappropriate speculation.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Language is sometimes clumsy with inconsistent tenses.</li> <li>Pieces of work contain all relevant sections with some errors in logical sequential</li> </ol> <p><b>May be some gaps in the portfolio</b></p>

		<b>But with some mistakes and/or omissions.</b>	2. Some sources of error or limitations are identified.*  <b>May be some gaps in the portfolio</b>	
40-49% 3	1. Shows some misunderstanding or limited understanding of the underlying scientific principles of the methodology used*	1. Most of the data presentation is OK, but there are significant mistakes and/or omissions.	1. States relevant conclusions but fails to explain how they reflect evidence. 2. Suggests only superficial improvements	1. Language is often clumsy with meaning of statements often unclear. 2. One or more sections have been omitted or presented in a poor order.
30-39% Fail	1. Shows significant misunderstanding of the underlying scientific principles	1. Presents relevant evidence inappropriately <b>or</b> incomprehensibly	1. States no conclusions <b>or</b> conclusions based on an unreasonable interpretation. 2. Suggests unrealistic improvements or no improvements	1. Language is often clumsy and structure is illogical. Overall, hard to follow.
15-29% Fail	1. Shows little understanding of the underlying scientific principles	1. Little or no evidence/content presented	1. States no conclusions <b>or</b> conclusions may misinterpret or misunderstand the findings.	1. Language is often clumsy and there are serious errors in the logical progression.
0-14% Fail	1. Shows no or little understanding of the underlying scientific principles	1. No data presented or presented incomprehensibly	1. States no conclusion <b>or</b> conclusions misinterpret or misunderstand the findings	1. Language is often clumsy, one or more sections of the report have been omitted