

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Complete the mark awarded column for each criterion and enter total mark in box at bottom of sheet.

		Mark awarded
9 – 10 7 – 8 5 – 6 3 – 4 1 – 2 0	1 Purpose of investigation – developing a focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very clear, focused statement of aims and key questions and detailed location. • A clear, focused statement of aims and key questions and location. • A clear statement of aims and key questions and location. • A statement of aims and key questions and location. • A weak statement of aims and key questions and location. • Student fails to state purpose. 	
13 – 15 10 – 12 7 – 9 4 – 6 1 – 3 0	2 Methodology of data selection, collection and recording <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant, evidenced comprehensive data collection programme. Appropriate, accurate techniques with sound methodology. Very organised and effective presentation. Shows initiative. • Mostly relevant, evidenced data collection programme. Usually appropriate techniques with understanding of methodology. Organised and effective presentation. • Satisfactory data collection programme with some evidence. Uses some techniques, with some understanding of methodology. Generally coherent presentation. • Somewhat limited data collection programme, limited evidence. One or two techniques used but limited understanding of methodology. Partially organised. • Very limited data collection, often inappropriate methodology. Poorly organised. • Student has been unable to devise a data collection programme. 	
9 – 10 7 – 8 5 – 6 3 – 4 1 – 2 0	3 Data representation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide range of well presented, appropriate data representation. • Range of well presented, usually appropriate data representation. • Satisfactory range of data representation, usually appropriate. • Limited range of data representation, often basic and not well selected. • Very limited range of data representation, basic and poorly selected. • Student does not attempt to represent the data collected. 	
21 – 25 16 – 20 11 – 15 6 – 10 1 – 5 0	4 Analysis and explanation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Precise explanation, detailed analysis of all results using a range of appropriate techniques. Clear understanding of overall trends. Appropriate use of models and theories to inform data analysis • Sound explanation, and analysis using a range of techniques. Some understanding of overall trends. Does refer to theory on occasion • Satisfactory explanation and analysis of most results, using appropriate but often basic techniques. Attempts an overview, but lacks understanding of overall results • Some explanation and analysis of results. Uses limited techniques often basic and inappropriate. • Many results not analysed. Little ability to see overall trends • No attempt to analyse and explain the results of the enquiry. 	
21 – 25 16 – 20 11 – 15 6 – 10 1 – 5 0	5 Evaluation and conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very thorough conclusion. All aspects of the enquiry have been reviewed and evaluated in considerable detail • A thorough conclusion. Most aspects of the enquiry have been reviewed and evaluated in some detail • A satisfactory conclusion. Some aspects of the enquiry have been reviewed and evaluated in detail • A conclusion attempted. Limited aspects of the enquiry have been reviewed and evaluated in restricted detail • A very limited attempt to conclude. Few aspects of the enquiry have been reviewed and evaluated • No attempt to conclude and evaluate the study. 	
13 – 15 10 – 12 7 – 9 4 – 6 1 – 3 0	6 Quality of written communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very well organised logical route to enquiry, with excellent standards of legibility, spelling, punctuation and grammar. Precise clear use of terminology. Very appropriate style of writing • Well organised route to enquiry, with very good standards of legibility, spelling, punctuation and grammar. Clear use of terminology. Appropriate style of writing • Satisfactory organisation, with sound standards of legibility, spelling, punctuation and grammar. Quite basic style of writing. Some figures not well incorporated • Poorly organised, weak style of report writing with figures not well incorporated. Considerable errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar, poor legibility. Investigation exceeds 2,500 words • Very poor organisation, style of writing and legibility. No logical route to enquiry. Frequent errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar • No attempt to organise and present the study to an acceptable standard. 	
	TOTAL MARK: (max 100)	

