

Criteria for Assignments: Grading will be on a percentage basis and students should also read the supplementary material on ‘parts of an assignment’ and the self-assessment sheets (when relevant). The ‘Weight’ column indicates the worth of each section. *Note the Title and Introduction, and Conclusion weights, and write accordingly.*

Assessment Criteria/Standard	Good – Excellent (3.5 – 5)	Satisfactory (2 –3)	Unsatisfactory (0 – 1.5)	Weight
<p>Title and Introduction. Is the title thought out and relevant? Importance of the topic stated. Main sections outlined, and hypothesis presented.</p>	<p>The title is well thought out and accurate. Well-constructed background information is given that puts the project into clear context. The importance of the topic to science or industry is clearly stated. The sections in the body of the project have been introduced logically. The hypothesis is clearly enunciated and at a high level for the program of study.</p>	<p>The title is relevant and accurate. Sufficient background information is given to put the project into context. The importance of the topic to science or industry is apparent. The main sections in the body of the project have been introduced and the hypothesis is presented at an appropriate level for the program of study.</p>	<p>The title is generic or vague. Insufficient background information is given to put the project into context. The importance of the topic to science or industry is not apparent. The main sections in the body of the project have not been introduced and the hypothesis is not presented.</p>	25%
<p>Content of the Main Body of the Project. Use of headings. Relevance of material to hypothesis. Quality of data (including figures and tables) collected and critical appraisal, end of section summaries.</p>	<p>The main sections and sub-sections provide structure and clarity. Each sub-section addresses a major point directed at the hypothesis. The data collected is highly relevant and is from scientific papers, and correctly referenced. Data is presented to show very clear understanding of the material used, and all have been critically appraised. Summaries at the end of each major section.</p>	<p>The main sections and sub-sections provide structure and clarity. Each section addresses the hypothesis. The data collected is relevant, is mainly from scientific papers with some books and the WWW, and is correctly referenced. Data presented shows understanding of the material. There is evidence that most data have been critically appraised.</p>	<p>The main sections and sub-sections are not logical. Each sub-section fails to address a major point directed at the hypothesis. The data collected is mainly from books and WWW sources. Data may not be correctly referenced. Data presented does not represent understanding of the material used. Most data have not been critically appraised.</p>	45%
<p>Conclusion. Topic importance reiterated. Main points presented and hypothesis addressed. Consequences to the industry or wider research community presented.</p>	<p>The importance of the topic is clearly restated. The main points from the body of the project are presented logically to lead to a clear solution or declaration on the hypothesis. The consequences of the findings to industry and research are clearly presented.</p>	<p>The main points from the body of the project are presented and lead to a solution or declaration on the hypothesis.</p>	<p>The main points from the body of the project are presented without logical development. Conclusion does not lead to a solution or declaration on the hypothesis.</p>	20%
<p>Style, format, and presentation. Spelling and grammar, correct use of figures and tables, correct use of units and quantities, correctly referenced throughout.</p>	<p>Style of report is clear and concise, with a logical flow. Use of subheadings to structure the report and promote clarity. Spelling is correct and good grammar is used throughout. Correct SI units are used. Referencing is accurate and according to that in the journal ‘Postharvest Biology and Technology’.</p>	<p>Style in keeping with report writing but may be improved for purposes of clarity. Some errors in spelling and grammar. Few errors in presentation and use of units and quantities. Standard referencing as in ‘Postharvest Biology and Technology’, with few inaccuracies.</p>	<p>Style detracts from the clarity of the report. Frequent errors in spelling or grammar, or in the use and presentation units and quantities. Referencing non-standard, inaccurate or absent. Any evidence of plagiarism.</p>	10%