YOUR NAME:	 DATE:
INVESTIGATION YOU ARE ASSESSING:	 

## 1. Personal Engagement

Total \_\_\_\_ / 2

This criterion assesses the extent to which the student engages with the exploration and makes it their own. Personal engagement may be recognized in different attributes and skills. These could include addressing personal interests or showing evidence of independent thinking, creativity or initiative in the designing, implementation or presentation of the investigation.

Descriptor	0	1	2
evidence of personal engagement with exploration	standard not reached	limited with little independent thinking, initiative or insight	clear with significant independent thinking, initiative or creativity
justification given for choosing the research question and/or the topic under investigation	standard not reached	does not demonstrate personal significance, interest or curiosity	demonstrates personal significance, interest or curiosity
evidence of personal input and initiative in the designing, implementation or presentation of the investigation	standard not reached	little evidence	clear evidence

## 2. Exploration Total \_\_\_ / 6

This criterion assesses the extent to which the student establishes the scientific context for the work, states a clear and focused research question and uses concepts and techniques appropriate to the Diploma Programme level. Where appropriate, this criterion also assesses awareness of safety, environmental, and ethical considerations.

Descriptor	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
topic of the investigation is identified and relevant research question described	standard not reached	some relevance is stated but it is not focused		relevant but not fully focused		relevant, fully focused and clearly described	
background information provided for the investigation	standard not reached	superficial or of limited relevance and does not aid the under-standing of the context of the investigation		mainly appropriate and relevant and aids the under-standing of the context of the investigation		entirely appropriate and relevant and enhances understanding of the context of the investigation	
appropriate of methodology of the investigation, consideration of factors for reliability and sufficiency of data	standard not reached	question, few if any but some		highly appropriate some limits on ficant factors factors considered		ly all	
evidence of awareness of the significant safety, ethical or environmental issues that are relevant to the methodology of the investigation	standard not reached	limited awareness		some awareness		full awareness	

3. Analysis Total \_\_\_ / 6

This criterion assesses the extent to which the student's report provides evidence that the student has selected, recorded, processed and interpreted the data in ways that are relevant to the research question and can support a conclusion.

Descriptor	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
raw data	standard not reached	insufficient to support a valid conclusion		relevant but incomplete. Could support a simple or partially valid conclusion		sufficient; could support a detailed and valid conclusion	
data processing, accuracy and consistent with data	standard not reached	some basic but too inaccurate or insufficient to lead to a valid conclusion		appropriate and sufficient raw data carried out that could lead to a conclusion but with significant inaccuracies and inconsistencies in processing		appropriate and sufficient data processing with accuracy so as to enable a conclusion to the research question to be drawn that is fully consistent with the experimental data	
impact of uncertainties on the analysis	standard not reached	impact of uncertainties impact of uncertainties		full and appropriate evidence of the impact of uncertainties			
interpretation of processed data	standard not reached	incorrect or insufficient interpretation that may lead to an invalid or very incomplete conclusion limited con		ion leading nplete or	correct inte allowing a valid and d conclusion	completely	

4. Evaluation Total \_\_\_/6

This criterion assess the extent to which the student's report provides evidence of evaluation of the investigation and the results with regard to the research question and the accepted scientific context.

Descriptor	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
conclusion statement	standard not reached	outlined but not relevant to the research question or not supported by the data presented		described, relevant to the research question and supported by the data presented		described in detail and justified, entirely relevant to the research question and fully supported by the data presented	
conclusion and accepted theory	standard not reached	superficially compared to the accepted scientific context		some relevant comparison to accepted scientific context		correctly described and justified through relevant comparison to the accepted scientific context	
strengths and weaknesses of the investigation, such as limitations of the data and sources of error, are discussed and provide evidence to a clear understanding of the methodological issues involved in establishing the conclusion	standard not reached	outlined but are restricted to an account of the practical or procedural issues faced		described and provide evidence of some awareness of the methodological issues involved in establishing the conclusion		discussed and provide evidence of a clear understanding of the method-ological issues involved in establishing the conclusion	
realistic and relevant suggestions for the improvement and extension of the investigation	standard not reached	very few outlined		some described		are discussed	

5. Communication Total \_\_\_/4

This criterion assesses whether the investigation is presented and reported in a way that supports effective communication of the focus, process and outcomes.

Descriptor	0	1	2	3	4	
presentation of the investigation	standard not reached	unclear, making understand the and outcomes		clear, any errors do not hamper understanding of the focus, process and outcomes		
report structure	standard not reached	not well structur unclear: the nec information on f and outcomes is presented in an disorganized wa	essary ocus, process missing or is incoherent or	well structured and clear: the necessary information on focus, process and outcomes is present and presented in a coherent way		
report relevance	standard not reached	the understanding of the focus, process and outcomes of the investigation is obscured by the presence of inappropriate or irrelevant information		relevant and concise thereby facilitating a ready understanding of the focus, process and outcomes of the investigation		
terminology	standard not reached	there are many of subject specif and conventions	ic terminology	the use of subject terminology and are appropriate errors do not ha standing	conventions and correct; any	