Improving Laboratory Learning Through Self and Peer Assessment of Laboratory Reports

Kieran Fergus Lim (林百君)^a

Corresponding author: kieran.lim@deakin.edu.au ^aSchool of Life and Environmental Sciences, Deakin University, Burwood VIC 3125, Australia

Keywords: academic writing, laboratory learning, peer assessment, self assessment

International Journal of Innovation in Science and Mathematics Education, 23(2), 59-73, 2015

Abstract

The laboratory provides an opportunity for students to achieve many learning outcomes including to critically evaluate information, interpret and draw conclusions from scientific data, and communicate scientific results, information, or arguments. This paper describes a laboratory-writing task that involves self and peer evaluation. After discussion of the expectations of laboratory report writing during class, students self and peer evaluate reports. In a process similar to double-blind journal refereeing, students practise critically evaluating the quality of academic writing using a rubric. The summative assessment is based on how consistent their evaluations are with the evaluations of the same reports performed by their peers. The formative assessment is that students receive peer evaluations and feedback via a rubric on reports that they have written. The skill of critically evaluating their own reports is used to improve the laboratory reports in subsequent assessment tasks.

Introduction

Written communication including the ability to write laboratory reports is an important part of a science degree (Jones, Yates, & Kelder, 2011). In addition, employers list written communication skills as a desirable attribute when hiring graduates, regardless of discipline (Fair, Kleist, & Stoy, 2014; GTI Media, 2015; The Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Business Council of Australia, 2002; Wood et al., 2010). Increasingly, there is a recognition that the development of written communication skills cannot be left to central academic skills units, but should be embedded within the curriculum (Bailey, 2001; Gordon et al., 2001; Knight & Yorke, 2003; Paulson, 2001; Tucci, O'Connor, & Bradley, 2014; Whelan & Zare, 2003; Windsor, Rutter, McKay, & Meyers 2014). Furthermore, guided writing can enhance learning about science while unguided writing assignments have little effect (Moore, 1993).

The use of computers to prepare reports has made it easy to prepare and revise more than one draft of a report, of which the final version is assessed (Chickering & Ehrmann, 1996). At Deakin University, Lim (2009) has given students the opportunity to submit draft reports; after feedback, they can "do it again, thoughtfully" and only the final report is subject to summative assessment. However, this approach would be impractical for large classes. At La Trobe University, Blanksby and Chan (2006) have used a combination of peer-review or review by demonstrators to give feedback on draft reports, with the aim of improving the final report. Russell (2005, 2013) at UCLA has a sophisticated computer-based system that enables double-blind peer evaluation of draft reports.

This paper describes a recent implementation, in which double-blind peer evaluation of a report is combined with self evaluation of subsequent laboratory reports. The explicit aim of this process is to develop the students' metacognitive skill of judging or assessing the quality of a report. While sharing some similarities with other programs (Berry & Fawkes, 2010; Blanksby & Chan, 2006; Hristova, 2014; Lim, 2009; Russell, 2005, 2013; Walker & Sampson, 2013), the current implementation assesses the quality of the self evaluation and peer evaluation by measuring the consistency of the evaluations.

Research Methodology and Study Design

This study follows the principles of Action Research (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988; Lewin, 1946, 1948; Lytle & Cochran-Smith, 1990; Wood et al., 2010; Zuber-Skerritt, 1992), in which a teacher/researcher:

- 1. Plans a course of action to remedy a perceived problem;
- 2. Acts to implement that course of action;
- 3. Observes the outcomes of the course of action; and
- 4. Reflects on the outcomes what worked and what did not work and uses that to conduct further cycles of planning, acting, observing and reflecting.

The perceived problem was that laboratory reports in level 2 and level 3 units were of mixed quality, including some reports of very low quality. It was believed that this problem was due to the inability of many students to judge the quality of their own work, objectively and realistically. The hypothesis was that a focus on how to write and evaluate a simple report, without complicated scientific content, would improve metacognitive self evaluation skills.

A teaching and learning exercise was implemented first to explicitly discuss the expectations of academic report writing, and second for students to practice self evaluation of their reports. A simple kitchen chemistry exercise was used so that students could focus on writing skills without being overly concerned about scientific content. While it would be expected that students cannot assess or evaluate pieces of academic writing as well an experienced marker, nevertheless, this intervention should improve the correlation between the student's self evaluation and that of an experienced academic staff marker. The quality of writing and the correlation between self and marker evaluation in later reports were used as primary measures of the effectiveness of this intervention. A secondary measure was based on the instructor's reflections.

In this paper, the term *evaluation* (*evaluate*) will refer to the judgement of the quality of a piece of academic writing, by returning a numerical *score*. The term *assessment* (*assess*) will refer to the process of assigning a *mark* for summative assessment. In the kitchen chemistry exercise described here, the *evaluation scores* were not the direct basis of the *summative assessment marks*. In the subsequent five laboratory reports, the *evaluation scores* from academic staff were the direct basis of the *summative assessment marks*, plus a small *mark* component based on the correlation between the student's self evaluation and that of an experienced academic staff marker.

The research described here has Human Research Ethics Approvals, Deakin University DUHR-EC-29-2008 and STEC-23-2012.

Study Context and Implementation

An early version of this teaching and learning intervention to improve laboratory report writing was based on the "do-ing it again, thoughtfully" (DIAT-ing) approach described by Chickering and Ehrmann (1996; Lim, 2009). The implementation was amended through several action research cycles in two units of study spread over several years; the implementation using self and peer evaluation in the summer of 2014-2015 is described here. The unit was a level 2 chemistry unit with 68 students. Six students had completed first year in the previous teaching session (semester). There were some single- and double-degree students who were at the end of their third or fourth year, including 12 students for whom this unit was their final unit before graduating.

As a summer-session unit, the unit was taught in intensive mode with a 3-hour block of lectures/workshops on four mornings in weeks 1 and 2, and on 2 mornings in week 3. Each student attended 2 laboratory sessions in the afternoons of weeks 2 and 3, and one morning laboratory session in week 3. The teaching and learning timetable is given in Table 1. Students completed the laboratory work in weeks 2 and 3, and the write-ups were completed and submitted between weeks 4 and 12. The kitchen chemistry exercise and laboratory reports were each worth 10% of the unit assessment.

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
		Week 1		
Principles of	Chemistry topics	Chemistry topics	Chemistry topics	Kitchen chemistry
report writing				report submitted
	Kitchen chemistry experiment (com	pleted outside class tim	ie)	
		Week 2		
Chemistry	Report evaluation, including	Chemistry topics	Chemistry topics	
topics	discussion of actual student			
	reports; use of EndNote [™] for			
	referencing; marking rubric			
Group A:	Group B: Laboratory 1	Group A:	Group B:	
Laboratory 1		Laboratory 2	Laboratory 2	
		Week 3		
Group B:	Chemistry topics	Analysis of	Group A:	Peer and self
Laboratory 3		laboratory data;	Laboratory 5	evaluations of
		Review		kitchen chemistry
Group A:	Group B: Laboratory 4	Group A:	Group B:	report submitted
Laboratory 3		Laboratory 4	Laboratory 5	
		Weeks 4-12		
Week 4	Laborato	ry report 1 and self eva	luation submitted	
Week 5	Laborato	ry report 2 and self eva	luation submitted	
Week 6	Laborato	ry report 3 and self eva	luation submitted	
Week 7	Laborato	ry report 4 and self eva	luation submitted	
Exam week	Laborator	ry report 5 and self eva	luation submitted;	
(week 12)		Case study submit	tted	

Table 1. Teaching and learning timetable for unit. The two rows of entries for weeks 1-3 represent morning and afternoon sessions.

The unit chair was responsible for all the lecture and workshop sessions and for the logistics of peer and self evaluations. This person also marked the major case study assessment; the case study is separate from the assessments discussed in this paper. Two other instructors demonstrated in the laboratory sessions and marked laboratory reports 1-5.

In week 1, class time was devoted to the discussion of the principles of good report writing, including:

- General principles
 - A: Accuracy (scientific validity and correctness)
 - B: Brevity (conciseness and relevance)
 - C: Clarity (precise communication)
- Important parts of the report
 - C: Context (introduction, background and literature review)
 - D: Data (method of gathering data; followed by evidence, results and observations)
 - E: Explanation (discussion, significance and meaning of data)
 - F: Findings (conclusions)

In a good report, the Explanation (discussion) of Data (results) will support the Findings (conclusions).

Students then completed a kitchen chemistry experimental investigation at home, in which the effect of added salt while cooking vegetables was investigated. This is linked to the area of molecular gastronomy, which is the science of chemical changes during cooking (Blanck, 2007; Le Blanc, 1992; Lister & Blumenthal, 2005; Palermo, Pellegrini, & Fogliano, 2014; Pellegrini et al., 2010; This, 2005). Other at-home experimental investigations are also possible (Kennepohl, 2007; Kennepohl & Shaw, 2010). A report on this investigation was submitted at the end of week 1.

In earlier versions of this unit, the unit chair had written the marking rubrics for the laboratory reports, but this apparently led to a lack of student "buy-in". For example, the previous rubric allocated 10% of each report mark to the correct use of citations, but even at the end of that iteration of the unit, many students were not putting citations in the body of the reports or were omitting essential information from the list of references. Thus, in week 2, class time was devoted to a discussion of how reports should be evaluated. The class discussed and voted on the point allocations for the rubric items and the criteria. There was some disagreement about various items; for example, some (including the unit chair) believed that no points should be allocated for an informative and descriptive report title, but a majority of the class wanted that item. The final negotiated rubrics had the weightings shown in Table 2. Some members of the class gave permission for their kitchen chemistry report to be discussed in class. Hence the week 2 class discussion also applied the rubric to these student reports in order to reach a class consensus of the expectations of the writing standard and of how to apply the rubric. The rubric for the kitchen chemistry report is given in the Appendix. The details of the scientific content part of the rubric varied for each report.

	Technical aspects of report writing	Agreement between self evaluation and academic marker's assessment of technical aspects of report writing	Scientific content	Summative assessment (marking)
Kitchen chemistry report (40 points, peer and self evaluation)	28 points	Not applicable	12 points	Based on comparison of peer and self evaluation
Laboratory reports (60 points each, academic marker's evaluation)	28 points	4 points	28 points	Based directly on academic marker's evaluation

Table 2. Breakdown of the rubrics for the kitchen chemistry report and the five laboratory reports.

Evaluation and assessment of the kitchen chemistry report

The kitchen chemistry report was peer and self evaluated, but was not assessed or marked by any member of academic staff; the marks for this exercise were based on a comparison of the peer and self evaluations as follows. Each kitchen chemistry report was manually assigned by the unit chair to peer evaluators, as shown in Table 3. The shaded cells illustrate the *systematic* allocation of reports to ensure:

- Each report was self evaluated by the student author;
- Each report was circulated to three or four classmate-peer evaluators;
- No set of student evaluators for any one report had more than one classmate-peer evaluators in common with the sets of student evaluators for any other report.

The unit chair manually assigned a code to each report, based on the last five digits of each student ID number. The report submitted by student 00004 was labelled with a code like 00004-00013-00011-00007-00001-2. Each five-digit block of numbers indicates a person: the author (self evaluator) and the three or four peer evaluators. The final single-digit, 2, indicates that that version of the report was circulated to the student identified by the 2nd block of digits (00013). This last digit is needed to uniquely label the *evaluations that are returned* by different students. The use of the last five digits of the student ID numbers was sufficient to uniquely distinguish each student. The use of the last part of the 9-digit student ID numbers, not the entire number, preserves student privacy.

Report author and	Peer evaluator 1	Peer evaluator 2	Peer evaluator 3	Peer evaluator 4
self evaluator				
00001		Did not su	ıbmit report	
00002		Did not su	ıbmit report	
00003		Did not su	ıbmit report	
00004	00014	00012	00008	00001
00005	00004	00013	00009	00002
00006	00005	00014	00010	00003
00007	00006	00004	00011	00001
00008	00007	00005	00012	00002
00009	00008	00006	00013	00003
00010	00009	00007	00014	00001
00011	00010	00008	00004	00002
00012	00011	00009	00005	00003
00013	00012	00010	00006	
00014	00013	00011	00007	

Journals have strict rules about how to prepare manuscripts for double blind refereeing. However, students did not follow the instructions to prepare their reports in a suitable format. Due to the tight timelines for circulating the reports to students for peer evaluation, the unit chair manually edited each report to remove all identifying names and student numbers, and renaming the report using the codes described above. This process took several hours, but ensured a faster turn-around than the estimated days that would have been involved if reports had been returned to students for editing into the correct format.

The marks for the kitchen chemistry task were based on the agreement between peer evaluation and self evaluation of the kitchen chemistry reports, rather than the quality of the reports. Each report was self evaluated and also had at least three peer evaluations. Comments made to the instructor indicated that the 13 students who chose not to submit a kitchen chemistry report did this to guarantee perfect agreement between peer evaluation and self evaluation scores of zero.

The scores for the kitchen chemistry were given out of 40 points (the rubric is provided in the Appendix). Following this process, the student evaluations were awarded a mark as follows:

- Full marks (4 out of 4), if the student's evaluation was within 5% (2 points) of the *range* of scores spanned by the other evaluations;
- Three marks (3 out of 4), if the student's evaluation was within 10% (4 points) of the *range* of scores spanned by the other evaluations;
- Two marks (2 out of 4), if the student's evaluation was within 15% (6 points) of the *range* of scores spanned by the other evaluations;
- One mark (1 out of 4), if the student's evaluation was within 20% (8 points) of the *range* of scores spanned by the other evaluations;
- Zero marks, if the student's evaluation was outside 20% (8 points) of the *range* of scores spanned by the other evaluations.

Tables 4 and 5 show illustrative evaluation scores from seven students for two separate reports. The evaluation scores in the Tables are not real class data.

Table	4.	Example	of	marks	awarded	to	four	students	who	evaluated	report
00013-	0001	2-00010-00	0006	with sco	ores of 24, 1	32, 3	87, and	36 out of 4	40.		

Student	Student's	Evaluation scores	Mark	Comment
	score	from other students		
00006	24	32, 36, 37	1 out of 4	Peer evaluation is within 20% (8
				points) of the range of other scores
00010	32	24, 36, 37	4 out of 4	Peer evaluation is within 5% (2
				points) of the range of other scores
00012	37	24, 32, 36	4 out of 4	Peer evaluation is within 5% (2
				points) of the range of other scores
00013	36	24, 32, 37	4 out of 4	Self evaluation is within 5% (2
(author)				points) of the range of other scores

It can be seen that Students 00010 and 00013 (Table 4) and Students, 00007, 00011 and 00013 (Table 5) had evaluations that were consistent with the *range* of scores spanned by the other students' evaluations, and therefore gained full marks. In Table 4, Student 00006 was a 'rogue' evaluator who returned an evaluation that was very inconsistent with those of the other students. Without Student 00006's 'rogue' evaluation, Student 00010 would have

probably scored a lower mark. The presence of a rogue evaluator in the group has made it easier for the other students in the group to gain higher marks.

Table 5 shows the marking for a report that was evaluated to be of low quality by all four student evaluators. It is clear that the marks do *not* depend on the *quality* of the report, but only on the *consistency* of each student's evaluation with the other students' evaluations. In Table 5, Student 00014 has optimistically self evaluated the report, and received a lower mark than the three peers.

Table 5. Example of marks awarded to four students who evaluated report 00014-00013-00011-00007 with scores of 7, 4, 6 and 11 out of 40.

Student	Student's	Evaluation scores	Mark	Comment
	score	from other students		
00007	7	4, 6, 11	4 out of	Peer evaluation is within 5%
			4	(2 points) of the range of other scores
00011	4	6, 7, 11	4 out of	Peer evaluation is within 5%
			4	(2 points) of the range of other scores
00013	6	4, 7, 11	4 out of	Peer evaluation is within 5%
			4	(2 points) of the range of other scores
00014	11	4, 6, 7	3 out of	Self evaluation is within 10%
(author)			4	(4 points) the range of other scores

The completed rubrics for each report were shared with all students who evaluated that report, so students could learn from the consistency (or lack thereof) of their evaluations (formative assessment). Significantly, it also means that each student can compare his/her self evaluation with peer evaluations.

In addition to his/her own self evaluation, each student was required to peer evaluate three other reports, so the final mark for this exercise (out of 16) is a combination of four evaluations like those shown in Tables 4 and 5. Students who chose not to submit a report are guaranteed a high mark (summative assessment) for the self evaluation of *their own reports*, but they lost the opportunity for feedback via peer evaluations of their reports (formative assessment).

Evaluation and assessment of the five subsequent laboratory reports

Students submitted both a laboratory report and a self evaluation of their technical writing for each of the five subsequent laboratory exercises. Academic staff marked these laboratory reports based on a 60-point rubric (see Table 2) including:

- evaluation of the technical writing using the same first part (first 28 points) of the rubric used for the kitchen chemistry report (see Appendix),
- comparison between the staff and student self evaluation of the technical writing, and
- evaluation of the scientific content.

Some students did not submit a self evaluation for some laboratory reports and lost the small mark component based on the agreement between self evaluation and staff assessment of technical aspects of report writing. Any student who did not submit a laboratory report received zero marks for that particular laboratory exercise. Many subsequent laboratory reports were submitted as team reports, resulting in less data for each subsequent laboratory exercise than the first kitchen chemistry report, which was submitted individually.

Results and discussion

This self and peer evaluation exercise was first implemented in the summer of 2012-2013. After some adjustment, it was implemented again in the summer of 2014-2015 and the results from that latter cohort are reported here. Fifty-five reports were written and underwent self evaluation. Of the 55 reports, 26 reports had three peer evaluations each, while 29 reports had four peer evaluations each. The additional peer evaluations ensured redundancy in case some students withdrew from the unit.

Figure 1 shows the raw evaluation scores. The technical aspects of laboratory report writing (Findlay, 1996; Lim, 2003; Silyn-Roberts, 1996; Tilstra, 2001) for each report were evaluated out of a maximum of 28 points (see Table 2 and the Appendix). These evaluations also had a small component on the scientific content of each report, which is not discussed here. Each report is associated with 3-4 data points in Figure 1, representing one self evaluation score plotted against 3 or 4 peer evaluation scores. For example, the three data points with a self evaluation score of 10 represent peer scores for a single report. All self evaluation scores with more than 4 data points represent several reports and there are some coinciding data points. The quality of the reports has wide variation, with some data points in the lower-left quadrant, associated with three reports that were both self and peer evaluated to be of fail standard.



Figure 1. Comparison of peer evaluations with self evaluations of the kitchen chemistry report.

A small number of reports were either peer or self evaluated as perfect (28 out of 28 points). The diagonal lines in Figure 1 indicate peer and self evaluations that are consistent to within a score of ± 3 , or approximately 10% or one grade. A significant number of reports fall outside the lines, with a greater number below the lines. Reports in the lower-right triangle have self evaluations significantly higher than peer evaluations.

Using the statistic y = (self evaluation score) - (peer evaluation score), the Student's paired t-test ($\overline{y}=1.1029$, stdev=4.0097, n=192, df=191, t=3.8112) indicates that at a confidence level in excess of 99.9%, self evaluations have higher scores than peer evaluations. However while the difference is statistically significant, it is also sufficiently small that if these peer

evaluations were real marks from academic staff, most (87%) of the self evaluations would be considered consistent with the peer evaluations under the University's assessment policy.

Figure 2 shows the academic staff markers' evaluations and students' self evaluations for the first and fifth laboratory reports after the kitchen chemistry exercise. There are fewer data points than in Figure 1 because some students had withdrawn from the unit during the summer while other students exercised the option of submitting team reports. (This unit had several non-traditional characteristics: for example, students were given the option of submitting individual or team laboratory reports, but that aspect is not discussed here.) As with Figure 1, there are some coinciding data points. Overall, there are less data for laboratory report 1 (left-hand panel of Figure 2) than laboratory 5 (right-hand panel), because many students did not submit a self evaluation for the first laboratory report.



Figure 2. Comparison of academic staff evaluations with self evaluations of the first and fifth laboratory report.

As with the kitchen chemistry exercise, there is a tendency towards overly optimistic self evaluations. Using the statistic $y = (self \ evaluation \ score) - (academic \ staff \ evaluation \ score)$, the Student's paired t-test for laboratory exercise 1 (\overline{y} =0.93103, stdev=2.8900, n=24, df=23, t=1.5782) indicates that self evaluations have higher scores than academic staff markers' evaluations at a confidence level of 85%, but there is no statistically significant difference at a confidence level of 90%. For laboratory exercise 5 (\overline{y} =2.4634, stdev=2.9419, n=41, df=40, t=5.3617), self evaluations have higher scores than academic staff markers' evaluations, at a confidence level in excess of 99.9%.

It is also clear that the overall distribution of scores moved to higher values: in Figure 1 there were a significant number of reports that were either self or peer evaluated as of poor quality. The data shown in Figure 2 for reports later in the unit indicates that there were *no* reports of poor technical quality. Significantly, Figure 2 has a greater proportion data points that are within the diagonal lines than Figure 1, indicating that students' self evaluations are fairly close to those of the markers. This indicates that the students have improved their metacognitive skill of evaluating the quality of their own reports.

Academic marker evaluations of the self and peer evaluation exercise are not available because the kitchen chemistry report was not marked or evaluated by an academic staff member. Hence there is no direct objective measure of whether the quality of technical writing changed. Instead, Figure 3 explores the students' self evaluations of their technical writing. Each data point represents one of the 37 students who completed both the kitchen chemistry report (Figure 1), and laboratory 5 (right-hand panel of Figure 2). Students' self evaluated technical writing skills generally improved during the summer as shown by the predominance of points towards the top of the graph. Two students who gave themselves perfect (28 out of 28) self evaluations at the start of the summer returned more realistic self evaluations at the end of the summer. Overall, the data in Figure 3 suggest that through a process of self evaluations of reports and feedback on those self evaluations, students improved their metacognitive self evaluation skills.



Figure 3. Comparison of self evaluations of the kitchen chemistry task (Figure 1) with self evaluations of the 5th laboratory report (Figure 2). Each data point represents one student who completed both the assignment task and the 5th subsequent laboratory report.

Comparing reports submitted in this level 2 summer unit with other level 2 units without a similar exercise gave the instructor the impression that this exercise improved the writing skills of students. However, no other evidence of the effectiveness of this self and peer evaluation exercise is available.

The university seeks feedback from students about every unit that is offered. The feedback for this unit contained very diverse views, with comments from some students in direct opposition to those from other students. Samples of feedback from the 2012-2013 cohort and from the 2014-2015 cohort are provided in Tables 6 and 7, respectively. There was some feedback that was very enthusiastic about the kitchen chemistry exercise, with students stating that they learnt a lot about report writing in this unit. There was also some extremely negative feedback that the exercise was too much work with insufficient guidance and that it was generally a waste of time. The instructor believes that the latter negative feedback was mainly from graduating students, who were seeking an easy summer unit to complete their degree. This belief is based on informal comments made in class and on the general attitudes of different groups of students. On the other hand, the positive feedback about the exercise suggests that it is worthwhile, albeit with further improvements and refinement.

Table 6. Typical free-text feedback to the questions "What were the best aspects of your unit?" and "What aspects of your unit were most in need of improvement?" from the 2012-2013 cohort. Responses were received from 18 students (45%), out of a total cohort of 40 students.

- It was good to learn how to actually write a good lab report. Helpful that the chemistry content wasn't too challenging, since the emphasis was on using this knowledge to write effective reports.
- The workload was manageable and there was always help given in the discussion section of [the learning management system].
- ... Due to the extreme range of abilities in our group, the lectures had to jump between extremely complex and very basic, but I found this really helpful.
- The unit was good in that it concentrated and taught how to write a proper lab report.
- ... The workload was very manageable which i think is especially important, being a T3 (summer) subject.
- feedback about lab reports [needs improvement].

Table 7. Typical free-text feedback to the questions "What were the best aspects of your unit?" and "What aspects of your unit were most in need of improvement?" from the 2014-2015 cohort. Responses were received from 22 students (32%), out of a total cohort of 68 students.

- Marking each other's work and self evaluation was very helpful
- The most helpful part was lab report writing, with templates and writing manuals available on [the learning management system].
- There was no helpful aspect to this unit...
- I don't think there is anything helpful of the unit ...
- No aspects of this unit were helpful. This unit suffers from a major design flaw in that being offered only every 2 years it tries to cater for too broad a level of abilities from 1st years through to 4th year.
- This unit is almost perfect...

The feedback in Tables 6 and 7 and the instructor's impressions indicate that this self and peer evaluation exercise needs further improvements and refinement. The data in Figures 1-3 is incomplete because some students did not do all parts of the exercise, or did not submit one or more of the subsequent laboratory reports. The data (especially Figure 3) could provide motivation for future students to fully engage with this exercise, and strongly suggest that the self and peer evaluation exercise has promising learning outcomes and is worth pursuing. However, the School has discontinued the kitchen chemistry experiment, because it and the subsequent five laboratory reports are considered to be too much work for students, especially in a summer unit. This is disappointing for the instructor, but will lead to a significant reduction in academic workload.

Conclusions

A double-blind peer evaluation has been combined with self evaluation of laboratory reports, in order to improve the metacognitive skill of evaluating the quality of their own reports, and thus to improve the writing skills of students. The summative assessment is that students are assessed on how closely their evaluations are consistent with peer evaluations of the same reports. The formative assessment is that students receive peer evaluations and feedback via a rubric on reports that they have written. Students then wrote further laboratory reports in the

same unit of study. Self evaluation of laboratory reports tended to return higher scores than both peer evaluation and academic staff marker evaluations, indicating that students are not totally objective in self evaluation.

Comparisons of the peer and self evaluations at the start of the summer, with the academic staff marker and self evaluations at the end of the summer, indicate that students with poor writing skills had improved their technical writing skills, and that all students had improved their metacognitive self evaluation skills.

Acknowledgements

The work reported here has human research ethics approval (DUHR-EC-29-2008, and STEC-23-2012-LIM). The author acknowledges the contributions of the reviewers, whose critical comments have helped to make this a better paper.

References

- Bailey, P. D. (2001). Teaching chemists to communicate? Not my job! *University Chemistry Education*, 5(2), 80-86.
- Berry, D. E., & Fawkes, K. L. (2010). Constructing the components of a lab report using peer review. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 87(1), 57-61. doi: 10.1021/ed8000107
- Blanck, J. F. (2007). Molecular gastronomy: Overview of a controversial food science discipline. *Journal of Agricultural & Food Information*, 8(3), 77-85. doi: 10.1300/J108v08n03_07
- Blanksby, T., & Chan, C. K. (2006). Feedback assessment of Science report writing for first year Genetics students. In *Proceedings of the Uniserve Assessment in Science Teaching and Learning Symposium* (pp. 161-164). Sydney, NSW: University of Sydney.
- Chickering, A. W., & Ehrmann, S. C. (1996). Implementing the seven principles: Technology as lever. *AAHE Bulletin, 49*(2), 3-6. Retrieved from

http://www.case.edu/ucite/media/caseedu/ucite/documents/seven_principles.pdf

- Fair, J. D., Kleist, E. M., & Stoy, D. M. (2014). A survey of industrial organic chemists: Understanding the chemical industry's needs of current bachelor-level graduates. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 91(12), 2084-2092. doi: 10.1021/ed400570f
- Findlay, B. (1996). How to write psychology laboratory reports and essays. Sydney: Prentice Hall.
- Gordon, N. R., Newton, T. A., Rhodes, G., Ricci, J. S., Stebbins, R. G., & Tracy, H. J. (2001). Writing and computing across the USM chemistry curriculum. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 78(1), 53-55. doi: 10.1021/ed078p53
- GTI Media. (2015, May 8). The top 10 skills that'll get you a job when you graduate. *TargetJobs*. Retrieved from targetjobs.co.uk/careers-advice/career-planning/273051-the-top-10-skills-thatll-get-you-a-job-when-you-graduate
- Hristova, Z. (2014). Using peers to assess oral presentations to foster learning. *International Journal of Innovation in Science and Mathematics Education*, 22(3), 74-80.
- Jones, S., Yates, B., & Kelder, J.-A. (2011). *Science: Learning and Teaching Academic Standards Statement*. Strawberry Hills, NSW: Australian Learning and Teaching Council. Retrieved from http://www.olt.gov.au/system/files/altc standards SCIENCE 240811 v3.pdf
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (Eds.). (1988). *The action research planner* (3rd ed.). Geelong, Vic: Deakin University Press.
- Kennepohl, D. (2007). Using home-laboratory kits to teach general chemistry. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 8(3), 337-346. doi: 10.1039/B7RP90008B
- Kennepohl, D., & Shaw, L. (Eds.). (2010). *Accessible elements: Teaching science online and at a distance*. Edmonton, Canada: Athabasca University Press.
- Knight, P., & Yorke, M. (2003). *Learning, curriculum and employability in higher education*. London and New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Le Blanc, B. (1992). Chemistry in the kitchen. Bath, UK: Cherrytree Press.
- Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 2(4), 34–46. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1946.tb02295.x
- Lewin, K. (1948). Resolving social conflicts: Selected papers on group dynamics. New York: Harper and Row.
- Lim, K. F. (2003). The Chemistry Style Manual (2nd ed.). Geelong, Vic: Deakin University.

- Lim, K. F. (2009). Doing it again, thoughtfully: Using feedback on draft reports to improve learning outcomes. *Australian Journal of Education in Chemistry*, 70, 11-16.
- Lister, T., & Blumenthal, H. (2005). Kitchen chemistry. London, UK: Royal Society of Chemistry.
- Lytle, S. L., & Cochran-Smith, M. (1990). Learning from teacher research: A working typology. *Teachers College Record*, 92(1), 83-104.
- Moore, R. (1993). Does writing about science improve learning about science? *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 22, 212-217.
- Palermo, M., Pellegrini, N., & Fogliano, V. (2014). The effect of cooking on phytochemical content in vegetables: A review. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, 94(6), 1057-1070. doi: 10.1002/jsfa.6478
- Paulson, D. R. (2001). Writing for chemists: Satisfying the CSU upper-division writing requirement. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 78(8), 1047-1049. doi: 10.1021/ed078p1047
- Pellegrini, N., Chiavaro, E., Gardana, C., Mazzeo, T., Contino, D., Gallo, M., ... Porrini, M. (2010). Effect of different cooking methods on color, phytochemical concentration, and antioxidant capacity of raw and frozen brassica vegetables. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 58(7), 4310-4321. doi: 10.1021/jf904306r
- Russell, A. A. (2005). Calibrated Peer Review[™] A writing and critical-thinking instructional tool. In *Invention* and Impact: Building Excellence in Undergraduate Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Education. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. Retrieved from http://www.aaas.org/sites/default/files/03_Suc_Peds_Russell.pdf
- Russell, A. A. (2013). The Evolution of Calibrated Peer Review[™] (Chapter 9). In T. Holme, M. M. Cooper & P. Varma-Nelson (Eds.), *Trajectories of Chemistry Education Innovation and Reform* (ACS Symposium Series 1145, pp. 129–143). Washington, DC: American Chemical Society. doi: 10.1021/bk-2013-1145.ch009
- Silyn-Roberts, H. (1996). *Writing for Science: A practical handbook for science, engineering and technology students*. Auckland, New Zealand: Addison Wesley Longman.
- The Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the Business Council of Australia. (2002). *Employability Skills for the Future*. Canberra, ACT: Department of Education, Science and Training (Australian Commonwealth Government).
- This, H. (2005). *Molecular gastronomy: Exploring the science of flavor (Arts & Traditions of the Table: Perspectives on Culinary History)* (M. Debevoise, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tilstra, L. (2001). *Laboratory report guidelines*. Retrieved from http://www.rosehulman.edu/~tilstra/laboratory report guidelines.htm
- Tucci, V. K., O'Connor, A. R., & Bradley, L. M. (2014). A three-year chemistry seminar program focusing on career development skills. *Journal of Chemical Education*, *91*(12), 2071-2077. doi: 10.1021/ed400667q
- Walker, J. P., & Sampson, V. (2013). Argument-driven inquiry: Using the laboratory to improve undergraduates' science writing skills through meaningful science writing, peer-review, and revision. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 90(10), 1269-1274. doi: 10.1021/ed300656p
- Whelan, R. J., & Zare, R. N. (2003). Teaching effective communication in a writing-intensive analytical chemistry course. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 80(8), 904-906. doi: 10.1021/ed080p904
- Windsor, S. A. M., Rutter, K., McKay, D. B., & Meyers, N. (2014). Embedding graduate attributes at the inception of a chemistry major in a Bachelor of Science. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 91(12), 2078-2083. doi: 10.1021/ed5001526
- Wood, L., Daly, A., Clark-Murphy, M., Kavanagh, M., Leveson, L., Dixon, P., ... Rigby, B. (2010). *Graduate Skills Project*. Retrieved from http://graduateskills.edu.au/
- Zuber-Skerritt, O. (1992). Professional development in higher education: A theoretical framework for action research. London, UK: Kogan Page, Ltd.

Appendix 1. Assessment rubric

				Report code:		-		-		-			-
		SL	.E235 Re	port Evalu	ation	Rub	oric 20)14					
				Assignmer	nt 1 o	nly							
The Title.													
The Title is not the content of t	informative an ne report. 0	d/or descripti	ve about	The Title is info content of the re	eport.	and de	scriptive	about	the				
The Introduct	on section is a	concise intro	oductory sta	tement of the no	ovel feat	ures of	the wor	k; the	object of t	he iı	ivestiga	tion v	vith any
essential histor	ical backgrou	nd; and a jus	stification fo	r publication fo	llowed,	if neces	sary, by	a brie	f account o	ofpi	elimina	ry	
aims: only incl	ude the scient	ific aims of tl	es. In a univ 1e investigat	ersity laborato	ry or as	signme	nt repor	τ, αο π	ot state the	e tea	ching-ai	1 a- 1ea	irning
Accurac	у 🔲	Is there suffic	ient backgro	and to the proble	m or inv	estigati	ion						
Brevity		Are there suff	ficient citation	ns to scientific jo	ournals a	nd/or b	ooks						
The Introductic	n The	The Ir	troduction	The Introd	uction s	ection	The In	troduct	ion				
section is either	Introductio	on section	n requires mo	ore sets out the	backgr	ound	section	is too	long				
acking or so	section is	inform	nation to exp	ain to the prob	lem or		and/or	too teo	hnical.				
deficient that it	is severely	backg	round to the	investigati	on. It ha	san	Some	of the c	ould be				
lacking.	deficient.	invest	igation.	style for a	general	reader.	Discus	sion se	ction				
0	1		2		3			2	-				
The Method	ection is a dec	cription of th	o ornorimo	tal (or compute	tional	nrocod	uros W	orking	dotails my	uct b	o givon	conci	colu:
with sufficien	t detail for an	informed rea	ader to repro	duce the experi	iment o	r comp	utation:	well-k	nown oper	atio	ns shoul	d not	be
described in a	letail. Supplie	rs of equipme	ent and mate	erials, and their	location	ıs, shou	ıld be m	ention	ed.				
	cy	Is the Metho	d section an	account of what	has beer	done (good), o	r is it a	set of instr	uctio	ons for so	meon	ne else to
Brevit	(do (poor)?					(-)2	
	H	Have all ess	ential masses	volumes and of	her deta	ils been	incorpo	rated in	to the body	/ poi / of t	the Meth	od se	ction?
		Has the mak	e and model	of specialist equi	pment b	een inc	orporate	d into t	he body of	the l	Method	sectio	n?
The Method	The Metho	od The l	Method T	he Method section	n is	The M	lethod se	ection i	s too				
section is eithe	r section is	secto	on ve	ry good in terms	of	long.	Descript	ion of t	he				
deficient that	t deficient y	vith more	details pr	eciseness and		concis	se by om	itting d	etails that				
is essentially	regard to t	he of the	e co	nciseness: it incl	ludes	a spec	ialist rea	ider wo	uld know,				
lacking.	details of	the proce	edures. th	e details of the		or by	summari	ising th	e				
0	procedure		pr pr	ocedures.		proce	dures to	a great	er extent.				
The Results s	ection would i	nclude inforr	nation such	as what you obs	erved a	nd wha	it you ac	hieved	. Numeric:	al re	sults ar	e ofte	n (not
always!) best	presented in t	abular or dia	grammatic i	form (but not be	oth for t	he sam	e results	5).					
Accura	су 🗌	Has there be	en appropria	e use of tables a	nd graph	is to sui	nmarise	and pro	esent results	s?			
	/ H	Are all relev	ant data mea	surements and o	sentenc bservati	es and j	paragrap he Resul	ns: ts secti	on (rood)	orat	e some i	eleva	nt results
		in the append	dices (poor)?		oscivan		iie reesui	is seen	G000), 1	. .	c some i	01010	11 10,50115
		Does the tex	t of the Resu	lts section inform	1 the rea	der wha	at key res	sults ar	e in the tabl	es a	nd graph	ıs?	
The	The Results	The Result	s section T	he Results section	n Th	e Resul	ts	The Re	sults				
resuits	lection is	is clear and	15 (100)	complete and	sec	mon set	sout	rection					
section is	severely	I LAND THE TAXABLE PARTY	owever	ecise However	it the	obserr	ations	long T	should				
section is either	severely leficient with	it lacks	owever, pr	ecise. However, cks clarity and/o	it the r and	observ l results	ations s of	long. I be mor	should e concise				
section is either lacking or	severely leficient with egard to the	it lacks completene	ess co	ecise. However, cks clarity and/o mciseness. The	it the r and the	observ l results variou	ations s of s	long. I be mor by bett	e concise er use of				
section is either lacking or so deficient	severely leficient with egard to the observations,	it lacks completene and/or prec	ess co ision. It da	ecise. However, cks clarity and/or onciseness. The ta should be	it the r and the pro	observ l results variou	ations s of s in a	long. I be mor by bett approp	e concise er use of riate use				
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is	severely deficient with regard to the observations, neasurements und/or results	it lacks completene and/or prec requires mo	owever, pr la ess co ision. It da ore su	ecise. However, cks clarity and/o onciseness. The tta should be mmarised more, rhans in tabular	it the r and the pro cle	observ l results variou ocedures ar, com	ations s of s in a plete,	long. I be more by bett approp of table graphs	a should e concise er use of riate use es and				
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking	severely deficient with regard to the observations, neasurements ind/or results.	it lacks completene and/or prec requires mo details of th observation	bwever, pr la ess co dision. It da bre su he pe hs and di	ecise. However, cks clarity and/o onciseness. The ita should be immarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form	it the r and the pro cle or pre n. con	observ l results variou ocedures ar, com ccise an incise m	ations s of s s in a plete, d anner.	long. I be mor by bett approp of table graphs	should e concise er use of riate use es and				
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking	deficient with regard to the observations, neasurements and/or results.	it lacks completene and/or prec requires mo details of th observation results.	swever, pr la ess cc iision. It da pre su ne pe ns and di	ecise. However, cks clarity and/o onciseness. The ta should be immarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form	it the r and the pro- cle or pre- n. con	observ l results variou ocedures ar, com ccise and	ations s of s in a plete, d anner.	long. I be mor by bett approp of table graphs	should e concise er use of riate use es and				
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0	deficient with regard to the observations, neasurements and/or results.	it lacks completene and/or prec requires mo details of th observation results.	swever, pr la ess co ision. It da pre su ne pe ns and di	ecise. However, cks clarity and/o nciseness. The ita should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form 3	it the r and the pro cle or pre n. con	observ l results various ocedures ar, com ccise and ccise mancise mancise	ations s of s in a plete, d anner.	long. I be mor by bett approp of table graphs	s hould e concise er use of riate use es and				
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0	deficient with regard to the observations, measurements and/or results.	to here in the second s	bwever, pr la sss co cision. It da ore su he pe hs and di	ecise. However, cks clarity and/o: nciseness. The tta should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form 3	it the r and the pro- cle or pre- n. con	observ l results variou: ocedure: ar, com cise an- cise m: 5	ations s of s s in a plete, d anner.	long. I be mor by bett approp of table graphs	should e concise er use of triate use es and 3				
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0 The Discussion Where approximately	deficient with regard to the observations, measurements ind/or results. 2 n section shou priate there s	it lacks completene and/or prec requires mo details of th observation results. 3 Id comment hould be a di	on the scope	ecise. However, cks clarity and/o onciseness. The ta should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form <u>3</u> of the method is he similarities	it the r and the pro- cle or pre- n. con	observ observ d results variou ocedures ar, com cise and cise m 5 validity	ations s of s s in a plete, d anner.	genera the r	should e concise er use of riate use es and 3 lity of the s	synt	hesis or d in the	comi	outation.
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0 The Discussio Where appro any similar r	deficient with regard to the observations, neasurements nnd/or results. 2 n section shot priate, there s sults previous	it lacks completene and/or prec requires m details of th observation results. 3 Id comment hould be a di ly published	owever, pr la sss contractions of the ss and di on the scope scussion of t in the litera	ecise. However, cks clarity and/o onciseness. The ta should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form <u>3</u> of the method he similarities a ture (textbooks	r and r and r the pro- cle or pre- n. con and its v and diffe	observ d results variou ocedures ar, com ccise an ccise an ccise an <u>5</u> validity erences rnals).	ations s of s s in a plete, d anner. , or the between The Dis	genera the rocussion	3 a should e concise er use of riate use as and 3 lity of the s assults press a section sh	synt	hesis or d in the d includ	comp repor	outation. rt and atement
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0 The Discussion Where appro- any similar ro of any conclu	deficient with regard to the poservations, neasurements und/or results. 2 n section shot priate, there s sults previous sions drawn fi	it lacks completene and/or prec requires m details of th observation results. 3 Id comment hould be a di ly published om the work	owever, pr la ess cc ision. It da ore su he pe is and di on the scope scussion of t in the litera	ecise. However, cks clarity and/o onciseness. The ta should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form <u>3</u> of the method i he similarities a ture (textbooks	it the r and cle or pre- n. cor and its v and jou	observ d results variou scelures ar, com scise and cise ma 5 validity erences rnals).	ations s of s s in a plete, d anner. , or the between The Dis	genera the recussion	3 bit too s should e concise er use of riate use es and 3 bity of the s sesults present a section sh	synt	hesis or d in the d includ	comp repo e a st	outation. rt and atement
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0 The Discussic Where appro any similar r of any conclu	2 a section show a section show printe, there s sould previous sions drawn fr cy	ti lacks completent and/or prec requires mo details of th observation results. 3 Id comment hould be a di by published om the work Is the Discus	on the scope scussion of t in the litera	ecise. However, cks clarity and/o onciseness. The ita should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form 3 of the method i he similarities a ture (textbooks written in senten	it the r and cle or pre- n. con and its v and diffe and jou ces and	sobserv l results variou: cedures ar, com cise and cise ma 5 validity erences rnals). paragra	ations s of s in a plete, d anner. , or the between The Dis	genera a the recursion	should e concise er use of riate use es and <u>3</u> lity of the s sesults press a section sh	synt	hesis or d in the d includ	comp repoi e a st	outation. rt and atement
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0 The Discussic Where approv any similar ro of any conclu Brevity Clarity	2 n section shot prists the section shot printer the section shot print	it lacks completent and/or prec requires ma details of th observation results. 3 uld comment hould be a di on the work Is the Discus Is the scienti Are there suit	on the scope scussion of t in the litera con the cope scussion of t in the litera c.	ecise. However, cks clarity and/o onciseness. The ita should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form 3 of the method i he similarities a ture (textbooks written in senten on clear and easy ons to scientific i	it the r and the pro- cle or pre- n. con- and its v and diffe and jou ces and r to unde-	sobserv l results variou: cedure: ar, com cise and cise main solution validity prences rnals). paragra and/or	ations s of s in a plete, d anner. , or the between The Dis phs?	genera a the rocussion	is hould e concise er use of riate use es and <u>3</u> lity of the s soults press a section sh	synt	hesis or d in the d includ	comp repoi e a st	outation. rt and atement
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0 The Discussic Where approv any similar ro of any conclu Brevit Deficient Clarity The	2 a section shot a section shot printe, there s source s	it lacks completent and/or prec requires ma details of th observation results. 3 dld comment hould be a di ily published om the work Is the Discus Is the scienti Are there su: The Discuss:	on the scope scussion of t in the litera is and di	ecise. However, cks clarity and/or nciseness. The ta should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form 3 of the method : he similarities a ture (textbooks written in senten on clear and easy ons to scientific j Discussion sect	it the r and the pro- cle or pre- n. con- and its v and diffe and jou ces and to unde journals	observ observ ar solution occedures ar, com ocise and ocise main scise main s	ations s of s in a plete, d anner. , or the between The Dis phs? books	genera a the re cussion	is hould e concise er use of riate use es and <u>3</u> lity of the s seults press a section sh Discussion	synt	hesis or d in the d includ	comp repoi e a st	putation. rt and atement
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0 The Discussion of any condition Brevity Clarity The Discussion	everely deficient with regard to the observations, measurements ind/or results.	ti lacks completent and/or prec requires ma details of th observation results. 3 dl comment hould be a di vy published om the work Is the Discus Is the scienti Are there sur The Discuss; section is cle	on the scope scussion of t in the litera t in the litera	ecise. However, cks clarity and/or nciseness. The ta should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form 3 of the method i he similarities a ture (textbooks written in senten on clear and easy ons to scientific j Discussion sect omplete and pre-	it the r and prc cle or prc n. cor and its v and diffe and jou ces and to unde journals	observ observ tresults various occedures ar, com cise and cise main scise mai	ations s of s s in a plete, d anner. , or the between The Dis phs? books ussion ets out	genera a the ro cussion	is hould e concise er use of riate use es and 3 lity of the s sults press a section sl Discussion on is too	synt	hesis or d in the d includ	comp repoi e a st	putation. rt and atement
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0 The Discussic Where appro any similar r of any conclu Brevit Clarity The Discussion section is	2 a section shot priate, there s sions drawn fr iccy The Discussion	ti lacks completent and/or prec requires ma details of ti observation results. 3 dld comment hould be a di dy published om the work Is the Discuss Is the scienti Are there sur The Discuss section is cle (too) concisse	on the scope scussion of t in the litera t. sis and di on the scope scussion of t in the litera t. sison section fic explanati fficient citati ar and is c	ecise. However, cks clarity and/or nciseness. The ta should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form 3 of the method i he similarities a ture (textbooks written in senten on clear and easy ons to scientific j Discussion secto omplete and pre- wever, it lacks	it the r and prc cle or prc n. cor and its v and diffe and jour ces and to unde journals tion T cise. so	observ observ tresults various occedures ar, com cise and cise main scise and cise main scise and cise main scise and cise main scise and and of the Disc ection s the scien	ations s of s s in a plete, d anner. , or the between The Dis phooks books cussion ets out tiffic	genera a the recussion The l sector	is hould e concise er use of riate use is and 3 lity of the s sults press a section sl Discussion on is too It should	synt	hesis or d in the d includ	comp repo e a st	outation. rt and atement
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0 The Discussic Where appro any similar r of any conclu Clarity The Discussion section is either lacking or	2 a section show private section show private section show private section show private, there s shows for some section show private, shows and show the section show private section section is severely lefficient with the section sectio	ti lacks completence and/or prec requires ma details of ti observation results. 3 did comment hould be a di dy published om the work Is the Discuss Is the scienti Are there su: The Discuss Section is cle (too) concise However, it	on the scope scussion of ti in the litera is in the litera is is is in the litera is is is is is i	ecise. However, cks clarity and/or inciseness. The ta should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form 3 of the method i he similarities a ture (textbooks written in senten on clear and easy ons to scientific j e Discussion secto omplete and pre- wever, it lacks ity and/or	it the r and cle or pre- n. cor and its v and diffe and journals iournals rcise. su the n	s observ e observ s obse	ations s of s s in a plete, d anner. , or the between The Dis books cussion tific and nce of	Ing. I be more been been been been been been been be	is houd e concise er use of riate use is and 3 lity of the s issults press a section sl Discussion on is too It should ore ise by	synt	hesis or d in the d includ	comj repoi e a st	putation. rt and atement
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0 The Discussic Where appro any similar r of any conclu Clarity The Discussion section is either lacking or so deficient	everely deficient with regard to the observations, measurements and/or results. 2 n section shot priate, there s isults previous sions drawn fn ccy The Discussion section is severely deficient with vegard to the	ti lacks completence and/or prec requires mi details of ti observation results. 3 dld comment hould be a di dy published on the work Is the Discus Is the scienti Are there sus section is cle (too) concise However, it completenes	on the scope score ar and is c sister at an ar and is c son the scope scussion of t in the litera c. fficient citation fficient citation fficient citation fficient citation ar and is c c. lacks class son for the scope	ecise. However, cks clarity and/or nciseness. The ta should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form 3 of the method : he similarities a ture (textbooks written in senten on clear and easy ons to scientific j e Discussion sect omplete and pre- wever, it lacks rity and/or uciseness. Possibi ater focus on	it the r and cle or pre- cle or pre- n. cor and its v and diffe and jour ces and r to unde cournals r cise. sit und ly, a sit	sobservy d results various ocedures ar, com ecise and cise mi- cise and cise mi- cise and cise mi- cise and paragra rrals). paragra and/or i he Disc ection s ne scien ignifica ign e result	ations s of s s in a plete, d anner. between The Dis books phs? books ussion ets out tific and nce of ts in a	Ing. I long. I be more by bett approp of tabl graphs genera a the r cussion The l section long. be m concc comit	is houd e concise er use of riate use es and 3 3 Discussion nis too It should ore ise by ing	synt	hesis or d in the d includ	comp repoi e a st	outation. rt and atement
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0 The Discussion Section is either lacking or so deficient that it is	2 a section shot priate, there s sults previous sions drawn fn (cy) The Discussion section is severely deficient with regard to the neaning and	ti lacks completens and/or prece requires m details of ti observation results. 3 Id comment hould be a di ily published om the work Is the Discuss section is cle However, it completenes and/or precis requires mor	on the scope score ar and first	ecise. However, cks clarity and/or nciseness. The ta should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form 3 of the method : he similarities a ture (textbooks written in senten on clear and easy ons to scientific j Discussion sect omplete and pre- wever, it lacks rity and/or iciseness. Possib ater focus on illarities, patterns	it the r and cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- and its v and diffe and jour ces and r to unde cournals tion T cise. s s ly, a si s cle cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- cle pro- c	observ d results variouscedure: science ar, com cise an incise m 5 validity erences rnals). paragra grangra rstand? inhe Disc cecton s is e scient ignifica e result lear, com	ations s of s s in a plete, d anner. between The Dis books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books books b	Ing. I long. I be more by bett approp of table graphs genera a the r cussion The l section long. be m conce comit irrele	is hould e concise er use of riate use es and 3	synt	hesis or d in the d includ	comp repoi e a st	outation. rt and atement
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0 The Discussion section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially	2 a section shore priate, there is solution is section is sec	ti lacks completent and/or prece requires m details of ti observation results. 3 uld comment hould be a di ily published om the work Is the Discuss section is cle to concisse However, it completeness and/or preciss requires mor commentary	on the score ision. It de cre su re pe as and di on the score scussion of t in the litera c. sion section ffic explanati fficient citati ion The ar and is c b. lacks clar s core sion. It gre s sin on the and	ecise. However, cks clarity and/or onciseness. The ta should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form 3 of the method : he similarities a ture (textbooks written in senten on clear and easy ons to scientific j e Discussion sect omplete and pre- wever, it lacks rity and/or ciseness. Possib ater focus on ilarities, patterns differences will	it the r and pro- clear clear pro- clear pro- clear pro- clear pro- clear pro- clear pro- clear pro- clear pro- clear pro- clear pro- clear con pro- pro- clear con pro- pro- clear con pro- clear con pro- clear con pro- clear con pro- clear con pro- clear con pro- clear con pro- clear con pro- clear con pro- clear con pro- clear con pro- clear con pro- clear con pro- clear con con pro- clear con con clear con con con clear con con clear con con con clear con con con clear con con con clear con con con clear con con con clear con con clear con con clear con con clear con con clear con con clear con con con clear con con con clear con con con con con con con con con con	dobserv d results various cecdures ar, com cise an cise m 5 	ations s of s in a plete, d anner. , or the between The Dis between The Dis books ussion ets out tific and nce of ts in a mplete, d anner.	genera a the r constitution graphs genera a the r cussion The 1 secti- long, be m conc omiti irrele unim	is houd e concise er use of riate use es and 3 lity of the soults press a section sh Discussion on is too It should ore se by ing yoant or portant	synt	hesis or d in the d includ	comp repoi	outation. rt and atement
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0 The Discussion any similar ro of any conclu Accura Clarity The Discussion section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking	2 n section shot printe, there s sould previous sould previous source of the sould source of the results.	ti lacks completent and/or prece requires ma details of ti observation results. 3 uld comment hould be a di ily published om the work Is the Discus Is the Scienti The Discuss section is cle (too) concise and/or precis and/or preceis and/or preceis commentary scientific me	on the scope as and di on the scope as and di scope as and di on the scope as and di on the scope as and di on the scope as and di di the scope as a di the scope ascope as a di the scope as a di the scope ascope ascope as a di the	ecise. However, cks clarity and/o onciseness. The ta should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form 3 of the method : he similarities a ture (textbooks written in sentem on clear and easy ons to scientific j e Discussion sect omplete and pro- ciseness. Possibilater focus on illarities, patternel differences will ke the Discussion	it the function of the second	observ d results various occdurei ar, com <u>5</u> validity paragra paragra rrals). paragra rrals). paragra rences rrals). paragra restand?	ations s of s s in a plete, d anner. , or the t between The Dis between The Dis between the Dis between the constant the constant and nce of ts in a mplete, and nce of ts in a mplete, and nce of ts in a maner.	genera a the r constitution graphs	is houd e concise er use of riate use es and 3 lity of the s soults present a section sh Discussion n is too It should ore se by ing want or portant ssion.	synt	hesis or d in the d includ	comp repoi	outation. ct and atement
section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking 0 The Discussion section is either lacking or so deficient that it is essentially lacking	2 a section shot printe, there s sould be a section shot printe, there s sould be previous sould be previous for a section shot printe, there s sould be previous for a section shot printe, there s sould be a section s section is severely leficient with regard to the neaning and significance of the results.	ti lacks completene and/or prece details of ti observation results. 3 ld comment hould be a di ily published om the work Is the Discus Is the scienti Are there su: The Discuss; section is cle (too) concisse and/or precis requires mor completenes and significa en and significa me and significa	on the scope scussion of t in the litera in the litera con the scope scussion of t in the litera cussion section fic explanatic ion The ar and is c cussion action lacks claus s con sion. It e sim on the and aning main nce of sec	ecise. However, cks clarity and/or nciseness. The tta should be mmarised more, rhaps in tabular agrammatic form 3 of the method : he similarities a ture (textbooks written in senten on clear and easy ons to scientific j Discussion sect omplet and pression tity and/or ticseness. Possibi- ater occus on illarities, patternes d differences will ke the Discussion tion clearer and/or ticsenese.	it then r and its v and its v and its v and its v r ourmals to und diff and jou ces and courmals u n to und its v to und its v n r its n to n r r es n cor r r es n cor r es n cor es n cor r es n cor r es n cor r es n cor r es n cor r es n cor r es r es n cor es n cor es n es cor es es n cor es es n cor es es es es es es es es es es es es es	observ d results various ceduret ar, com 5 validity paragra rrals). paragra rrals). paragra rrals, o paragra rences rrals).	ations s of s s in a plete, d anner. , or the between The Dis between The Dis between The Dis books cussion ets out tific and nce of ts in a mplete, nd nanner.	Ing. I be more by bett approp of table graphs genera a the r- cussion The i section long. be m conce omit irrele unim discu	is houd e concise er use of riate use es and 3 lity of the s soults present a section sh Discussion It should ore use by ing vant or portant ssion.	synt	hesis or d in the d includ	comp repo e a st	outation. rt and atement

study, with a sum	r) Conclu 1mary of [the main Is the (ion should not sim findings and conc Conclusion section	ply duplicate state lusions of the stud written in sentences	ements in ly. s and parag	the di graph	iscussion, but present s?	an overview of the whole
Brevity Clarity	Ē	If you	only read the Concl	usion section, is it	a clear and	d com	plete summary of all th	e main points in the entire
The Conclusion	The Con	clusion	The Conclusion	The Conclusion se	ction	The C	onclusion section is	
section is either	section is	s	section requires	sets out summary of	of the	too lo	ng and/or too	
lacking or so	severely		more	main findings and	1	techni	ical. The main	
deficient that it	deficient	t.	information on	conclusions of the	study.	findin	igs and conclusions	
is essentially			the main	It has an appropria	te	should	d be summarised more	
lacking.			findings and	length and style fo	ra i	and/o	r the less important	
			conclusions.	general reader.		detail	s omitted.	
	1		2	3			2	
The References s include the labor	ection sh atory ma	ould be a nual or l	ecture notes – you	ks and journal pay should refer to the	pers that e books ai	you h nd pa	ave cited in your repo pers on which the lab	ort. References should not oratory manual or lecture
notes are based.	-					_		
Accuracy Requires	L		in-text citations to	low a recognised a	na		Do the references cons	istently follow a recognised
	Г	Do the	references list all e	scential details?			in_text citations?	ich is consistent with the
The citations in th	e hody	The cita	tions and/or the	The citations and	or the	The	citations and the	
of the report and/o	or the	Referen	ces follow an	References are co	mplete	Refe	erences are complete	
References section	n are	appropr	iate and/or	in the bibliograph	ic	in th	e bibliographic	
either lacking or s	0	consiste	nt style but are	details but do not	t follow	deta	ils and follow an	
deficient that it is		missing	many essential	an appropriate an	d/or	appr	opriate and consistent	
essentially lacking	g.	details.	-	consistent style.		style	a.	
0			1	1		-	2	
	_		-				-	
The report should	l use app	ropriate	language and conv	entions to commu	nicate wit	th the	reader.	_
Is there con	rect and c	consistent	use of	Is there correct and	consisten	t use o	of superscripts	Is there consistent use
scientific na	ames and	units (eg	mass,	and subscripts?				of correct grammar?
not weight))?			is there correct and	consisten	it use o	of L	Is there consistent use
Is there con	rect and c	consistent	use of SI	multiplication signs	s and other	r mati	nematical and	of correct spelling?
There is little as as		Ph		There is mostly		The		
of scientific langua	Juse 1	neufficier	one (out	of scientific land	good use	1 ne	sistent use of	
and conventions	ige i	nconsister	nt) use of scientific	conventions	guage and	scie	ntific language and	
and conventions	1	anguage a	and conventions	conventions.		con	ventions	
0	-		1	2			3	
							Technical conort	
							Technical report	
						ſ	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28)	
The report espec	ially the l	Roculte a	nd Discussion soft	ions should domo	nstrato th		Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) tor's knowledge skill	and understanding
The report, espec	ially the l	Results a	nd Discussion sect	ions, should demo	nstrate th	ie wri	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill aared? The control shot	s and understanding.
The report, espec	ially the l	Results a trol exper-	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic ntrol experiment	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate	nstrate th ilts can be use of a co	e wri comp	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill wared? The control show experiment	s and understanding. Id give a negative result.
The report, espec	ially the l e of a cont lequate us 0	Results a trol exper se of a cor)	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment.	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate	nstrate th ilts can be use of a co 1	e wri comp ontrol	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill aared? The control show experiment.	s and understanding. Id give a negative result.
The report, espec Is there use There is no or inad	ially the l e of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan	Results a trol experi se of a cor) tities or p	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic htrol experiment. properties be reliabl	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively ol	nstrate th ilts can be use of a co 1 bserved or	ne wri comp ontrol l	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill aared? The control show experiment.	s and understanding. Id give a negative result.
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho	ially the l e of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro	Results a trol exper- se of a cor titities or p operties	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. properties be reliably it is possible, but	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively ol hifficult, to	nstrate th ilts can be use of a co 1 bserved or The chos	ne wri compontrol 1 r meas	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill ared? The control shot experiment. sured? antities or properties	s and understanding. Id give a negative result.
The report, espec	ially the l e of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec	Results a trol expense of a con) titities or p operties tively	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic trol experiment. properties be reliabl It is possible, but of reliably and object	ions, should demoo the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively ol difficult, to ively observe or	nstrate th ilts can be use of a ca l bserved or The chos can be re	ne wri comp ontrol l r meas sen qu eliably	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill wared? The control shot experiment. sured? autities or properties antities or properties and objectively	s and understanding. Ild give a negative result.
The report, espec Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quanti cannot be reliably observed or measu	ially the l e of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec ared.	Results a trol expen- se of a cor) titities or p operties titvely	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic throl experiment. roperties be reliably It is possible, but reliably and objec measure the chose	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of difficult, to tively observe or n quantities or	nstrate th ilts can be use of a co l bserved or The chos can be re observed	ne wri comp ontrol 1 r meas sen qu eliably 1 or m	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill bared? The control shot experiment. sured? anatities or properties y and objectively easured.	s and understanding. Id give a negative result.
The report, espec Is there use There is no or inad Can the chu The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu	ially the l e of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec ared.	Results a trol exper- se of a con) titities or p operties tively	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. roperties be reliably It is possible, but of reliably and objece measure the chose properties.	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of hifficult, to tively observe or n quantities or	nstrate th ults can be use of a ca 1 bserved or The chos can be re observed	ne wri compontrol 1 r meas sen qu eliably d or m	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill bared? The control shot experiment. sured? antities or properties y and objectively easured.	s and understanding. Id give a negative result.
The report, espec Is there use There is no or inad Can the chu The chosen quantit cannot be reliably. observed or measu 0	ially the J e of a cont lequate us osen quan ties or pro and objec ired.	Results a trol exper- se of a con) trities or p operties trively	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. roperties be reliably It is possible, but reliably and objec measure the chose properties.	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of difficult, to tively observe or n quantities or	nstrate th ults can be use of a ca l bserved or The chos can be re observed	ne wri comp ontrol l r meas sen qu eliably d or m	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arred? The control show experiment. aured? antities or properties y and objectively easured. 2	s and understanding. Id give a negative result.
The report, espec Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0	ially the l e of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec rred.	Results a trol exper se of a cor) titities or p operties tively	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. roperties be reliabl It is possible, but reliably and objec measure the chose properties.	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of lifficult, to tively observe or n quantities or	nstrate th llts can be use of a co l bserved or The chos can be re observed	ne wri comp ontrol l r meas sen qu eliably l or m	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill ared? The control short experiment. autices or properties y and objectively easured. 2	s and understanding. Id give a negative result.
The report, espec Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantif cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the expe	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec ured.) eriment de	Results a trol exper se of a cor) titites or p operties tively essigned so	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but reliably and objec measure the chose properties.	ions, should demo the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of difficult, to ively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily	nstrate th ils can be use of a co bserved or The chos can be re observed	ne wri compontrol 1 r meas sen que eliably d or m	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill aared? The control shot experiment. aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured? aured aured? aured aured aured? aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured aured	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. or very similar samples?
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the expe Does the e	ially the l e of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec ured.) eriment de xperimen	Results a trol exper- se of a cor) titites or p operties tively esigned so t have sta	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic trol experiment. roperties be reliabl It is possible, but or reliably and objec measure the chose properties.	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of difficult, to tively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily ther there are multip	nstrate th lts can be use of a c bserved or The chos can be re observed y repeat th ple similar	e wri comp ontrol t r meas sen qu eliably d or m	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill wared? The control shouler experiment. wred? want objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same s (eg peas) or multiple	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. or very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the expe Does the e each trial I	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec ured.) eriment de experimen has a sur	Results a trol exper- se of a cor) titites or p operties tively essigned so t have sta Il number	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. roperties be reliably It is possible, but reliably and objec measure the chose properties. that someone one tistical validity? Ei of items.	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of difficult, to tively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily ther there are multip	nstrate th lits can be use of a c bserved or The chos can be re observed	ne wri compontrol 1 r meas sen qu eliably d or m	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arred? The control short experiment. aured? antities or properties y and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same s (eg peas) or multiple	s and understanding. Id give a negative result.
The report, espec Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably. observed or measu 0 Is the experiment we be constructed by the second Is the experiment we the construction of the second Is the experiment we	ially the le of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro- and object red.	Results a trol experi- se of a cor titities or p perties tively esigned so t have sta 11 number The exp	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but reliably and objec measure the chose properties.	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of hifficult, to tively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily her there are multip The experiment is	nstrate th lits can be use of a ci bserved or The chose can be re observed y repeat th ple similar s	r measure sen qu e export r items	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill aread? The control short experiment. autities or properties y and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same of s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. or very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the expe Does the e each trial H The experiment w difficult or imposs	ially the le of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro- and objec rred.) eriment de wayneriment has a small rould be sible to	Results a trol exper- se of a cor) titites or p perties tively essigned so t have sta 11 number The exp repeatal	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. To experiment. It is possible, but reliably and objec measure the chose properties. that someone one tistical validity? Eii of items. erriment is ole, but lacks	ions, should demo the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of difficult, to ively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily her there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and h	nstrate th lifs can be use of a ci bserved or The chose can be re observed y repeat th ple similar s as some	ae wri comp ontrol r meass esen qu eliably d or m r items The repe	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill avared? The control show experiment. aured? antities or properties antities or properties antities or properties antities or properties antities or properties antities or properties antities or properties (experiment. 2 eriment with the same (or genesic) or multiple experiment is atable, and has	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. or very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the experiment The experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi-	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec rred.) eriment de experimen has a smal rould be sible to iment	Results a trol exper se of a cor) tritites or p poperties trively esigned so thave sta 11 number The exp repeatal statistic	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic throl experiment. To properties be reliably reliably and objec measure the chose properties. that someone one- tistical validity? En of items. periment is object but lacks al validity.	ions, should demo the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of difficult, to ively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily her there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and ha (but inadequate) s	nstrate th lts can be use of a c l bserved or The chos can be re observed y repeat th ple similar s as some statistical	ae wri comp ontrol l r meass esen qu eliably d or m r items The repe stati	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill wared? The control should be experiment. wred? mantities or properties analytics or properties and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is eatable, and has stical validity.	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. or very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if
The report, espec Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi- lacks statistical va 0	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec rred.) eriment de xperimen has a smal rould be sible to iment didity.	Results a trol exper se of a cor b poperties titites or p poperties titively essigned so t have sta 11 number The exp repeatat statistic	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. roperties be reliably It is possible, but i reliably and objec measure the chose properties. to that someone one- tistical validity? Ei of items. periment is ole, but lacks al validity.	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of hifficult, to tively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily ther there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and ha (but inadequate) s validity.	nstrate th lts can be use of a co l beserved or The chos can be re observed y repeat th ple similar s as some statistical	e wri compontrol l r meassen qu eliably d or m ne export r items The repestati	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arred? The control show experiment. aured? antities or properties y and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is atable, and has stical validity.	s and understanding. Id give a negative result.
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the chi The chosen quantit cannot be reliably. observed or measu 0 Is the experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi- lacks statistical va 0	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec ured.) eriment de xperimen has a smal ould be sible to iment didity.	Results a trol exper se of a cor pertises titites or p operties trively essigned so t have sta 11 number The exp repeatal statistic	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but reliably and objec measure the chose properties. that someone one tistical validity? En of items. bet hat someone one tistical validity? En of items. bet hat komeone one tistical validity? En of items.	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively ol hifficult, to tively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily ther there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and hr (but inadequate) s validity. 2	nstrate th lits can be use of a ci l bserved or The chos can be re observed y repeat th ple similar s as some statistical	ne wri compontrol l r meassen qu eliably d or m ne export r items The repestation	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arred? The control short experiment. autices or properties y and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same of s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is eatable, and has stical validity. 3	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. or very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the expe Does the ce each trial H The experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experiment w 0 Does the re	ially the least of a continue	Results a trol experi- se of a cor) titites or p operties trively essigned so t have sta 11 number The exp repeatal statistic	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. roperties be reliably if is possible, but reliably and objec measure the chose properties. that someone one tistical validity? Eu of items. beriment is ole, but lacks al validity. 1 rorect and reliable	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of lifficult, to tively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily her there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and h (but inadequate) s validity. 2 evant scientific con	nstrate th ilts can be use of a c 1 bserved or The chose can be re observed y repeat th ple similar s as some statistical cepts?	r measure experience of the state of the sta	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arared? The control short experiment. aured? autities or properties or and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is atable, and has stical validity. 3 a the actual results (not	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. Id give a negative result. or very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if ideal results)?
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the expe Does the e each trial f The experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi- lacks statistical va 0 Does the re Does the re	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec rred.) eriment de sible to iment didity. eport, as a eport, as a	Results a trol exper se of a cor) tities or p poperties tively esigned so thave sta 11 number The exp repeatal statistics a whole, h a whole, a	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but reliably and objec measure the chose properties. b that someone one tistical validity? Eii of items. weriment is ole, but lacks al validity. <u>1</u> ave correct and rele pply correct and rele	ions, should demo the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of difficult, to ively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily her there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and ha (but inadequate) s validity. 2 evant scientific con levant scientific con te to link the result	nstrate th lits can be use of a ci lits can be can be re observed observed y repeat th ple similar s as some statistical cepts? to be co	ae wri compontrol l r meas sen qu eliably d or m The repe stati	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arered? The control show experiment. aured? anatities or properties anatities or properties or properties anatities or propertie	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. or very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if ideal results)?
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the experiment The experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi lacks statistical va 0 Does the re Does t	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec tred.) eriment de experimen has a smal rould be sible to iment liddity. eport, as a eport, as a eport, as a	Results a trol exper se of a cor) trities or p poperties trively esigned so t have sta Il number The exp repeatal statistic a whole, a a whole, a	nd Discussion sect iment, against which atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but of reliably and object measure the chose properties. that someone one- tistical validity? Eif of items. eriment is ole, but lacks al validity. 1 nave correct and reli- pply correct and reli- pply correct and reli- pive reasons/evidem.	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of fifficult, to tively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily ther there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and hr (but inadequate) s validity. 2 evant scientific con evant scientific con evant scientific con te to link the result	nstrate th lts can be use of a ci bserved or The chose can be re observed y repeat th ple similar as some statistical cepts? acepts to e s to the class?	ae wri compontrol l r meass sen qu eliably d or m The repe stati	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arred? The control short experiment. aured? antities or properties y and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same is (eg peas) or multiple experiment is atatable, and has istical validity. 3 n the actual results (not findings or conclusions)	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. If give a negative result. If give a negative result. If give a negative result. If give a negative results If give results If gi
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the expe Does the e each trial I The experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi- lacks statistical va 0 Does the re Does the re Does the re 1 s the repo	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec rred.) erriment de xperimen has a smal rould be sible to iment didity. eport, as a eport, as a eport, as a eport, as a	Results a trol exper se of a con b tritites or p poperties trively essigned so t have sta 11 number The exp repeatal statistic a whole, fa a whole, a a whole, a	nd Discussion sect iment, against which atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but i reliably and object measure the chose properties. that someone one- tistical validity? Eif of items. eriment is ole, but lacks al validity. 1 ave correct and reli- pply correct and reli- ply correct and reli-ply correct and rel	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively ol hifficult, to tively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily ther there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and hi (but inadequate) s validity. 2 evant scientific con tevant scientific con te to link the result lictions or problem	nstrate th lts can be use of a cu bserved or The chos can be re observed y repeat th ple similar s as some statistical cepts? acepts to e s to the cla s?	r measure r measure r measure r iteme te explain r repe stati	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arred? The control short experiment. aured? antities or properties y and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is eatable, and has stical validity. 3 n the actual results (not findings or conclusions ons?	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. Id give a negative result. or very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if ideal results)? ?
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably. observed or measu 0 Is the experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi- lacks statistical va 0 Does the re Does the repo- Is the repo-	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec ured.) eriment de experiment diverse sible to iment didity. eport, as a eport, as a eport, as a what this of the second the second second second second the second second second second se	Results a trol exper se of a cor) titites or p operties trively essigned so t have sta 11 number The exp repeatal statistics a whole, h a whole, g a whole, g resolve a hole, free oning val	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but reliably and objec measure the chose properties. that someone one of tistical validity? En of items. eriment is ole, but lacks al validity. <u>1</u> nave correct and relive piply correct and relive ite reasons/evident my aparent contrat of scientific inconsi id and free of error	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of tifficult, to tively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily her there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and h (but inadequate) s validity. 2 evant scientific con tevant scientific con text to link the result lictions or problem istencies and scient	nstrate th lits can be use of a c 1 bserved or The chose can be re observed y repeat th ple similar s as some statistical ccepts? accepts to the cla s? ific contra	e wri comp ontrol r meas sen qu eliably d or m r items r items r tems set explain aims, f	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arred? The control short experiment. autices or properties analities or properties and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same 4 s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is atable, and has stical validity. 3 a the actual results (not findings or conclusions ons?	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. Id give a negative result. or very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if ideal results)? ?
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably. observed or measu 0 Is the expe Does the e each trial f The experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi- lacks statistical va 0 Does the re Does the re Does the d Is the repo Is the scier The report	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec rred.) eriment de experimen has a smal rould be sible to iment didity. eport, as a eport, as a whitic reas T	Results a trol exper se of a cor) poperties trively essigned so thave sta ll number The exp repeatal statistics a whole, a a whole, a a whole, a a whole, a cresolve a hole, free coning val	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. roperties be reliabl It is possible, but reliably and objec measure the chose properties. of the someone one tistical validity? Ei of items. be that someone one of items. eriment is ole, but lacks al validity. 1 1 ave correct and reliable pipt correct and reliable my apparent contract of scientific incoms id and free of error' has some use of	ions, should demo the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of difficult, to ively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily her there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and h (but inadequate) s validity. 2 evant scientific con- levant scientific con-	nstrate th lts can be bserved or The chose can be re observed y repeat th ple similar s as some statistical cepts? ific contra s' ific contra chose to e s to the cla s' ific contra the chose to e the ch	the write component of the control o	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill avared? The control short experiment. aured? aured? and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is atable, and has stical validity. 3 n the actual results (not findings or conclusions ons? The report, as a	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. Id give a negative result. or very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if ideal results)? ?
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the chosen quantitic cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the expect Does the e each trial H The experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi lacks statistical va 0 Does the r Does the r	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec rred.) eriment de experimen has a smal rould be sible to iment lidity. eport, as a eport, as a unific reas Tic cont e or sources	Results a trol exper se of a cor) trities or p operties trively esigned so t have sta Il number The exp repeatal statistic a whole, a a whole, a a whole, a a whole, free oning val he report cientific c	nd Discussion sect iment, against which atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but of reliably and object measure the chose properties. That someone one- tistical validity? Eif of items. eriment is ole, but lacks al validity. <u>1</u> have correct and reli- pive reasons/evidem. my apparent contrat of scientific incons id and free of error has some use of	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of difficult, to tively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily ther there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and ha (but inadequate) s validity. 2 evant scientific con- te to link the result istencies and scient the report, as a w good use of scient	nstrate th lts can be bserved or The chose can be re observed y repeat th ple similar s as some statistical cepts? infic contra s' total contra the chose can be re observed y repeat th ple similar s s to the classification s' the contra s' the contra s' the contra s' the contra s' the contra s' the contra s' the contra s' the contra s' s' s' s' s' s' s' s' s' s'	the write component of the component of	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arred? The control short experiment. aured? antities or properties y and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same is (eg peas) or multiple experiment is atatable, and has istical validity. 3 a the actual results (not findings or conclusions ons? The report, as a whole, uses correct	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. If give a negative result. For very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if ideal results)? ?
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the experiment The experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi lacks statistical va 0 Does the report Does the report Is the report demonstrates little no knowledge, and	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec rred.) eriment de experimen has a smal rould be sible to iment lidity. eport, as a eport, as a eport, as a eport, as a cont for a so in the second cont of	Results a trol exper se of a cor pertises titities or p poperties titively essigned so t have sta Il number The exp repeatat statistic a whole, g a whole, g resolve a hole, free oning val he report cientific c assons/ev	nd Discussion sect iment, against which atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but i reliably and object measure the chose properties. that someone one- tistical validity? Eif of items. eriment is ole, but lacks al validity. <u>1</u> <u>ave correct and reliably</u> poly correct and reliable pive reasons/evidem my apparent contract of scientific inconsi id and free of error has some use of oncepts as	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively ol lifficult, to tively observe or n quantities or tively observe or tively observe or tively observe or to a relatively easily there there are multiple repeatable, and ha (but inadequate) s validity. 2 vant scientific con tevant scientific con tevant scientific con tevant scientific con tevant scientific con tevant scientific con the result istencies and scient The report, as a w good use of scient as reasons/eviden	nstrate th lts can be use of a co lts berved or The chose can be re- observed v repeat th ple similar sas some statistical cepts? ncepts to e s to the cla s? ific contra thole, has tific conce ce to link	a e writ comp ontrol r meass sen que iably d or m r explain repe stati explain inims, f adictic epts the	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arred? The control short experiment. aured? antities or properties y and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is eatable, and has stical validity. 3 a the actual results (not findings or conclusions ons? The report, as a whole, uses correct and relevant	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. Id give a negative result. or very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if ideal results)? ?
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the expect Does the e each trial I The experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi- lacks statistical va 0 Does the re Does the re Does the re Does the re Is the secient The report demonstrates little no knowledge, and has little or no	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec rred.) erriment de xperimen has a smal rould be sible to iment lidity. eport, as a eport, as a uscussion rt, as a whittic reas the or sc d/or re	Results a trol exper se of a cor pertises titites or p poperties titively essigned so t have stal 11 number The exp repeatal statistic a whole, fa a whole, a a whole, a a whole, g resolve a hole, free coning val he report cieatofic c casons/evi	nd Discussion sect iment, against which atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but of reliably and object measure the chose properties. that someone one of tistical validity? En- of items. eriment is ole, but lacks al validity. <u>1</u> nave correct and reli- give reasons/evident my apparent contrad- of scientific incons- id and free of error' has some use of oncepts as dence to link the he claims, findings	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively ol ifficult, to tively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily ther there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and hi (but inadequate) s validity. 2 evant scientific con- text on high the result lictions or problem isstencies and scient as reasons/eviden results to the clain	nstrate th lits can be use of a ci bserved or The chose can be re observed y repeat th ple similar s as some statistical cepts? acepts to e s to the cla s? ific contra chole, has tific contex cet to link ms, finding	ae wrii compontrol creasen queliably d or m eliably d or m The repestation static adiction epts the gs or	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arred? The control short experiment. aured? antities or properties y and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same of s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is eatable, and has stical validity. 3 an the actual results (not findings or conclusions ons? The report, as a whole, uses correct and relevant scientific concepts as	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. by very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if ideal results)? ?
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the choice The chosen quantit cannot be reliably; observed or measu 0 Is the expe Does the re each trial f The experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi- lacks statistical va 0 Does the re Does the dist Is the scier The report demonstrates little no knowledge, ann has little or no application of	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec rred.) eriment de xperimen has a smal rould be sible to iment hidity. eport, as a eport, as a uscussion rt, as a wh ntific reas cor for e or for e or for e or for e or for e or for e or for for e or for e or for for e or for for for for for for for for for for	Results a trol experi- se of a cor butities or p operties trively essigned so at have statistic thave statistic a whole, h a whole, a a whole, g resolve a hole, free soning val he report cientific c assons/evi ssults to th	nd Discussion sect iment, against whic atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but reliably and objec measure the chose properties. that someone one of thistical validity? En of items. that someone one of thistical validity? En of items. that someone one of the correct and reliable piply correct and reliable piply correct and reliable piply correct and reliable pipt correct and reliable pipt correct and reliable iter reasons/eviden my apparent contract of scientific incoms id and free of error' has some use of oncepts as idence to link the he claims, findings ons, but there are	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of itificult, to tively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily her there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and h (but inadequate) s validity. 2 evant scientific con te to link the result lictions or problem istencies and scient b The report, as a w good use of scient as reasons/eviden results to the clait conclusions, but t	nstrate th <u>ilts can be</u> <u>ilts can be</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introductor</u> <u>introduc</u>	the explain a component of the explorement of the explorement the explorement the explaint the explorement the explorem	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill avared? The control short experiment. aured? autities or properties of and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same of s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is atable, and has stical validity. 3 a the actual results (not findings or conclusions ons? The report, as a whole, uses correct and relevant scientific concepts as reasons/evidence to	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. by the second s
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi- lacks statistical va 0 Does the re Does the re S the scieler The report demonstrates little on on application of Knowledge to the	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec rred.) eriment de experiment hidity. eport, as a eport, as a eport, as a or, as a unific reas Tr e or sc d/or re re n m n m n m n m n m n m m m m m m m m m m m m m	Results a trol exper se of a cor) trities or p operties trively esigned so t have sta Il number The exp repeatal statistic a whole, a a whole, a a whole, a hole, free <u>oning val</u> he report isentific c easons/evi ssults to tf r conclusi ajor inad	nd Discussion sect iment, against which atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but of reliably and object measure the chose properties. That someone one- tistical validity? En- of items. between the someone one- tistical validity? En- of tems. remement is ole, but lacks al validity. <u>1</u> nave correct and reli- pive reasons/evidem ny apparent contrat of scientific incons- id and free of error has some use of has some use of noncepts as idence to link the ne claims, findings ons, but there are equacise either in	ions, should demo the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of difficult, to ively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily her there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and ha (but inadequate) sy validity. 2 vant scientific con tevant scientific con tevant scientific con tevant scientific con tevant scientific con tevant scientific con teresults lictions or problem istencies and scient The report, as a w good use of scient as reasons/eviden results to the clain conclusions, but t minor inadequaci	nstrate th lts can be to beerved or The chose can be re observed observed observed or repeat th ple similar s as some statistical cepts? cepts? cepts to es s to the cla s? ific contra thole, has tific concer ce to link ms, finding here are es either in	e explains, 1 e explains, 1 e explaints, 1	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arred? The control short experiment. aured? antities or properties / and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same - s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is atatable, and has istical validity. 3 a the actual results (not findings or conclusions ons? The report, as a whole, uses correct and relevant scientific concepts as reasons/evidence to link the results to the	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. Id give result.
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably: observed or measu 0 Is the experiment The experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi lacks statistical va 0 Does the re Does the re Does the re Is the report lacks statistical va 0 Does the re Does the dir Is the report demonstrates little no knowledge, and has little or no application of knowledge to the interpretation of th	ially the l of a cont lequate us osen quan ties or pro and objec rred.) eriment de experiment has a smal rould be sible to iment tlidity. eport, as a eport, as a eport, as a could be international could be internatinternational could be international could could be internat	Results a trol exper e of a cor poperties titites or p poperties tively esigned so thave stal Il number The exp repeatal statistic a whole, a a whole, g resolve a hole, free coning val he report cientific c cientific to cientific to cienti	nd Discussion sect iment, against which atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but of reliably and object measure the chose properties. to that someone one- tistical validity? Eif of items. eriment is ole, but lacks al validity. <u>1</u> ave correct and reliably pup correct and reliably pup correct and reliably in apparent contract of scientific incons- id and free of error has some use of oncepts as ons, but there are equacies either in ic concepts or in	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively ol lifficult, to tively observe or n quantities or tively observe or to link the result tictions or problem istencies and scient of scient as reasons/eviden results to the clain conclusions, but t minor inadequaci	nstrate th lts can be use of a co list of	are write componential remeasure exponential dor main and the remeasure explain addiction explain aims, f	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arred? The control short experiment. arred? antities or properties y and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is atable, and has stical validity. 3 a the actual results (not findings or conclusions ons? The report, as a whole, uses correct and relevant scientific concepts as reasons/evidence to link the results to the claims, findings or	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. Id give a negative result. or very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if ideal results)? ?
The report, espec Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the expect Does the e each trial I The experiment w difficult or imposs repeat. The experi- lacks statistical va 0 Does the repo- Does the repo- Is the repo- Is the repo- Is the repo- Is the scier The report demonstrates little no knowledge, and has little or no application of knowledge to the interpretation of th data.	ially the l of a cont lequate us osen quan ties or pro and objec rred.) eriment de xperimen has a smal sible to iment didity. eport, as a eport, as a eport, as a eport, as a d/or re re of m he th	Results a trol exper se of a cor pertises titities or p poperties titively essigned so t have stal 11 number The exp repeatal statistic a whole, h a whole, a a whole, a a whole, a a whole, a t necessary resolve a hole, free coning val he report cientific c casons/evi essults to th r conclusi	nd Discussion sect iment, against which atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but i reliably and object measure the chose properties. that someone one- tistical validity? Eit of items. eriment is ole, but lacks al validity. 1 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	ions, should demo h the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively ol hifficult, to tively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily ther there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and hr (but inadequate) s validity. 2 event scientific con- text o link the results lictions or problem isstencies and scient of scient as reasons/eviden as reasons/eviden results to the clain conclusions, but t minor inadequaci scientific concept scientific concept scientific concept scientific concept scientific reasoni	nstrate th lts can be use of a ci bserved or The chose observed y repeat th ple similar s as some statistical cepts? acepts?to e s to the cla s? ific contra thole, has tific concer ce to link ms, finding here are es either in s or in the ng.	are write componential remeasen que eliably d or m measen que eliably d or m measen que eliably d or m measen que stati repessant addiction epts the gs or n the	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arred? The control short experiment. autifies or properties y and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same of s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is eatable, and has stical validity. 3 n the actual results (not findings or conclusions ons? The report, as a whole, uses correct and relevant scientific concepts as reasons/evidence to link the results to the claims, findings or conclusions.	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. by very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if ideal results)? ?
The report, espect Is there use There is no or inad Can the cho The chosen quantit cannot be reliably observed or measu 0 Is the expe Does the e each trial f The experiment w difficult or impose repeat. The experi- lacks statistical va 0 Does the r Does the r not be scient The report demonstrates little no knowledge, ann has little or no application of knowledge to the interpretation of th data. 0	ially the l of a cont lequate us 0 osen quan ties or pro and objec rred.) eriment de xperimen has a smal rould be sible to iment lidity. eport, as a eport, as a eport, as a uscussion rt, as a wh ntific reas d/or re re or be the the	Results a trol experi- se of a cor- buttities or properties trively esigned soc thave stall number The exp repeatal statistics a whole, h a whole, h a whole, free oning val he report cientific c easons/evi- sisults to the repeatal statistics a whole, g resolve a hole, free solve a trively trively cientific c easons/evi- sisults to the resolution the solution the solution the trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trively trivel	nd Discussion sect iment, against which atrol experiment. roperties be reliably it is possible, but of reliably and object measure the chose properties. to that someone one of tistical validity? End of items. eriment is ole, but lacks al validity. <u>1</u> nave correct and reli- give reasons/evident my apparent contrat of scientific inconssi dand free of error' has some use of oncepts as idence to link the ne claims, findings ons, but there are equacies either in fic concepts or in ic reasoning. <u>2</u>	ions, should demo in the other test resu There is adequate y and objectively of tifficult, to tively observe or n quantities or can relatively easily her there are multip The experiment is repeatable, and h (but inadequate) sv validity. 2 evant scientific con te to link the result lictions or problem isstencies and scient 2 The report, as a w good use of scient as reasons/eviden results to the clair conclusions, but t minor inadequasi scientific reasoni 4	nstrate th lits can be use of a con- lits can be re- can be re- observed of The chose can be re- observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed observed o	The explain set explain the explored of the explored the explored of the explo	Technical report writing sub-total (out of 28) ter's knowledge, skill arared? The control short experiment. autities or properties y and objectively easured. 2 eriment with the same of s (eg peas) or multiple experiment is atable, and has sitical validity. 3 an the actual results (not findings or conclusions ons? The report, as a whole, uses correct and relevant scientific concepts as reasons/evidence to link the results to the claims, findings or conclusions. 6	s and understanding. Id give a negative result. Id give a negative result. or very similar samples? repeats of the experiment if ideal results)? ?

Report total (out of 40)