Continuous Assessment: Report (40%)

Criteria	Excellent (5 points)	Good (4 points)	Satisfactory (3 points)	Needs Improvement (2 points)	Poor (0-1 points)
1. Scientific Terminology	Consistently uses precise, accurate, and appropriate scientific terminology. All terms are used correctly in context.	Uses scientific terminology accurately with only rare, minor imprecision. Demonstrates a good understanding of the terms.	Generally uses scientific terminology correctly, but with occasional imprecision or minor misuse of terms.	Frequently misuses or inaccurately applies scientific terminology, demonstrating a limited understanding of the concepts.	Demonstrates a significant lack of understanding of scientific terminology, often using incorrect or inappropriate terms.
2. Clarity & Conciseness	Writing is exceptionally clear, concise, and easy to follow. Ideas are expressed with maximum efficiency. Virtually flawless spelling throughout the entire report. No detectable errors. Exemplary grammar and sentence structure. Sentences are clear, concise, and grammatically correct.	Writing is clear and generally concise. Minor instances of wordiness or ambiguity. Very few spelling errors (1-2 minor errors). Does not distract from readability. Minor grammatical errors (1-2 errors) that do not hinder understanding. Sentence structure is generally strong.	Several grammatical errors (3-5 errors) that occasionally make sentences awkward or unclear.	Writing is frequently unclear, verbose, or ambiguous, requiring significant effort to understand. Frequent spelling errors (6-10 errors). Significantly distracts from readability. Frequent grammatical errors (6-10 errors) and awkward sentence structures that significantly impede understanding.	Writing is consistently unclear, verbose, and confusing, making it very difficult to comprehend the content. Pervasive spelling errors (11+ errors). Makes the report difficult to understand. Pervasive grammatical errors (11+ errors) and convoluted sentence structures, making the report largely unintelligible.
3. Formatting & Consistency	Adheres perfectly to all specified formatting guidelines (e.g., citation style, headings, figures). Consistent throughout.	Minor deviations from formatting guidelines (1-2 instances). Generally consistent.	Some inconsistencies or deviations from formatting guidelines (3-5 instances).	Frequent inconsistencies or significant deviations from formatting guidelines (6-10 instances).	Disregards most formatting guidelines. Inconsistent and unprofessional presentation.

4. Introduction & Literature Review	Provides a comprehensive and insightful review of relevant literature, clearly establishing the research gap and rationale. Clear hypothesis.	Good overview of relevant literature, clearly identifies research gap and rationale. Somewhat clear hypothesis.	Adequate literature review, but may lack depth or clarity in establishing the research gap. Has a hypothesis.	Limited literature review, research gap not clearly identified or justified. Has a hypothesis, but very unclearly worded.	Inadequate literature review, fails to establish research context or rationale. Lacks hypothesis.
5. Methodology	Detailed, logical, and reproducible methodology. Justifies experimental design and data collection methods.	Clear and mostly reproducible methodology. Most aspects are well-justified.	Methodology is understandable but may lack some detail or justification for certain steps.	Methodology is unclear, incomplete, or lacks sufficient detail for replication.	Methodology is poorly described, illogical, or impossible to replicate.
6. Discussion	Provides a thorough and insightful interpretation of results, linking them to existing literature and addressing limitations.	Good interpretation of results, generally links to literature and discusses limitations.	Adequate interpretation of results, but may lack depth or comprehensive discussion of implications or limitations.	Limited interpretation of results, poor connection to literature, or inadequate discussion of limitations.	No meaningful interpretation of results, fails to connect to literature, or ignores limitations.
7. Conclusion	Strong and concise conclusion that summarizes key findings and their significance. Clearly addresses the research questions.	Good conclusion that summarizes key findings and addresses research questions.	Adequate conclusion, but may lack conciseness or fully address all research questions.	Weak conclusion, fails to summarize key findings or adequately address research questions.	No clear conclusion or fails to address any research questions. No novel conclusion, just a restatement of previous findings (not from this project).
8. References	Comprehensive and accurately formatted reference list. All sources cited correctly in-text. Proper credit given to other people who did work mentioned.	Good reference list, mostly accurate formatting and in-text citations.	Adequate reference list, but may have minor formatting errors or inconsistencies in in-text citations.	Incomplete or inaccurately formatted reference list. Significant errors in in-text citations.	Inadequate or absent reference list. No proper in-text citations. Plagiarism. No proper credit given where proper credit is due.

Continuous Assessment: Oral Presentation (40%)

Criteria	Excellent (5 points)	Good (4 points)	Satisfactory (3 points)	Needs Improvement (2 points)	Poor (0-1 points)
1. Clarity & Legibility & Logical Development & Flow	Slides are exceptionally clear, visually appealing, and highly legible with appropriate font sizes, colors, and minimal clutter. Slides are meticulously designed to convey key information effectively, allowing complete understanding of the content without the need for verbal explanation. The presentation exhibits a highly logical, coherent, and seamless pattern of development, with smooth transitions between ideas and sections.	Slides are clear and legible; generally well-designed and easy to read. Slides are well-structured and generally understandable on their own, clearly supporting the presentation. The presentation demonstrates a logical pattern of development, with clear progression of ideas.	Slides are mostly clear and legible, but may have minor issues with font size, color, or minor clutter. Slides convey core information, but some details or connections may require verbal explanation to be fully grasped. The presentation is generally logical, but may have occasional minor breaks in flow or less effective transitions.	Slides are often unclear or difficult to read due to poor design choices (e.g., small font, busy backgrounds, poor contrast). Slides contain insufficient information or are poorly organized, making them difficult to understand without the presenter's verbal input. The presentation's development is often unclear or disjointed, making it difficult to follow the main argument.	Slides are consistently unclear, illegible, or overwhelming, significantly hindering comprehension. Slides are indecipherable or offer little meaningful content without the presenter's verbal explanation. The presentation lacks a coherent structure, appearing disorganized and very difficult to follow.
2. Verbal Presentation Quality. Q&A. Knowledge Depth.	Delivery is exceptionally clear, concise, fluent, and engaging. Speaker maintains excellent pace, volume, and articulation throughout. Demonstrates a profound understanding of the topic, providing insightful, accurate, and	Verbal presentation is clear and generally succinct, with good pace and articulation. Able to understand and answer most questions accurately and effectively, demonstrating good grasp of the topic.	Verbal presentation is understandable, but may have occasional instances of wordiness, hesitations, or varied pace/volume. Generally able to understand and answer questions,	Verbal presentation is often unclear, rambling, or difficult to understand due to poor articulation, volume, or excessive speed/slowness. Struggles to understand questions or provides incomplete, inaccurate, or evasive answers.	Verbal presentation is consistently unclear, confusing, or largely unintelligible. Unable to understand questions or provides consistently incorrect/irrelevant answers, indicating a poor grasp of the topic.

	comprehensive answers to all questions, even complex ones.		though some answers may lack depth or precision.		

Continuous Assessment: Class Participation (20%)

Criteria	Excellent (5 points)	Good (4 points)	Satisfactory (3 points)	Needs Improvement (2 points)	Poor (0-1 points)
1. Project Engagement & Time Management	Consistently dedicates significant and productive time to the project, demonstrating exceptional commitment and efficient use of work periods. Responds promptly to communications.	Spends satisfactory and productive time on the project, meeting expectations for effort. Responds relatively promptly to communications.	Generally spends adequate time on the project, but there may be minor inconsistencies in productivity. Inconsistent responses.	Inconsistent effort or insufficient time spent on the project, impacting progress. Does not respond promptly to communications.	Minimal time or effort invested in the project, significantly hindering progress. Sometimes no responses at all.
2. Critical Thinking & Problem Solving	Proactively identifies and proposes highly relevant and insightful ideas and analyses that significantly enhance the project's direction and outcomes.	Contributes relevant ideas and analyses that effectively advance the project.	Provides ideas and analyses that are generally relevant, but may lack depth or originality.	Offers limited or less relevant ideas and analyses, requiring significant guidance.	Rarely contributes ideas or analyses, or contributions are consistently irrelevant.
3. Professionalism & Dependability. Documentation & Record Keeping	Consistently meets all deadlines and commitments with exceptional punctuality and preparedness. Maintains a meticulously organized, highly detailed, and perfectly legible log book/documentation that clearly reflects all activities and decisions.	Consistently punctual and meets deadlines as expected. Maintains a legible and well-organized log book/documentation of activity, adequately tracking progress.	Generally punctual and meets most deadlines, with occasional minor deviations. Maintains a log book/documentation that is generally legible and tracks activity, but may lack detail or organization in areas.	Frequently misses deadlines or is often late, impacting project flow. Documentation is often disorganized or illegible, making it difficult to track activity or decisions.	Consistently fails to meet deadlines or is often absent/unprepared. Fails to maintain a log book or documentation, or it is consistently illegible and uninformative.
4. Scientific Acumen &	Demonstrates the development of	Has developed many attributes necessary for	Shows some development of	Demonstrates limited development of attributes	Shows minimal or no development of attributes

Development. Contextual Understanding	numerous essential attributes for scientific endeavor or professional endeavor (e.g., critical inquiry, ethical conduct, collaboration, data interpretation). Articulates a sophisticated understanding of how their work integrates into and contributes to the broader scientific or professional field.	scientific or professional endeavor, showing good potential. Demonstrates a clear understanding of how their work fits into the broader field.	attributes necessary for scientific or professional endeavor, but further growth is needed. Shows a general understanding of their work's context within the field, but may lack depth.	essential for scientific or professional endeavor. Has limited understanding of how their work relates to the broader field.	necessary for scientific or professional endeavor. Demonstrates little to no understanding of the broader context of their work.