

## Assessment criteria

---

### Part A - Planning

Element	Marks		Criteria
<b>Equipment</b>	2	0 marks	Gives no relevant detail
		1-2 marks	a) Chooses most relevant resources/equipment b) Explains reasons for choices and choices are fully relevant to method

Element	Marks		Criteria
<b>Controls</b> (If variables are to be controlled, criteria a1 and b1 will be used. If there are no variables to control, criteria a2 and b2 will be used. The specific criteria needed will be in the controlled assessment task.)	6	0 marks	Gives no relevant controls
		1–2 marks	a1) Identifies one appropriate variable to control b1) Describes how this variable can be controlled OR a2) Identifies one appropriate way to control the task b2) Describes this way of controlling the task
		3–4 marks	a1) Identifies some relevant variables to control b1) Gives an appropriate description of how to control these variables OR a2) Identifies some relevant ways to control the task to produce meaningful results b2) Describes how these ways control the task
		5–6 marks	a1) Identifies a range of variables appropriate to control b1) Gives an appropriate explanation of how to control these variables OR a2) Provides a comprehensive list of relevant ways to control the task to produce meaningful results b2) Explains how these ways control the task

Element	Marks		Criteria
<b>Hypothesis</b>	4	0 marks	Provides no relevant hypothesis
		1–2 marks	a) Provides a hypothesis that is appropriate for most of the task b) Partially justifies the hypothesis
		3–4 marks	a) Provides a hypothesis that is appropriate for the full scope of the task, based on relevant scientific ideas b) Justifies the hypothesis fully using relevant scientific ideas
<b>Risks</b>	4	0 marks	No relevant detail given
		1–2 marks	a) Identifies a relevant risk which is specific to the task b) Suggests measure(s) to manage the risk
		3–4 marks	a) Identifies most of the relevant risks which are specific to the task b) Method reflects how risks need to be managed
<b>Overall plan</b>	4	0 marks	Gives no relevant method
		1–2 marks	a) Method is logically ordered to produce results b) Chooses range of data/observations that would test the hypothesis
		3–4 marks	a) Method is logically ordered to produce results and includes an explanation of why it would test the hypothesis b) Chooses range of data/observations that would test the hypothesis and explains why the range was chosen
<b>Total marks</b>	<b>20</b>		

## Part B - Observations

Element	Marks		Criteria
<b>Primary evidence and recording</b>	4	0 marks	Collects no primary evidence
		1 mark	Records some data/observations that are appropriate for the topic
		2 marks	Collects a suitable range of data/observations and records some appropriately (depends on the practical)
		3 marks	Collects a suitable range of data/observations and records all appropriately (depends on the practical)
		4 marks	Collects a suitable range of data/observations and records all appropriately (depends on the practical) and records further/repeat data
<b>Secondary evidence</b>	2	0 marks	Collects no secondary evidence
		1 mark	Collects and records secondary evidence relevant to the hypothesis in a way appropriate for the topic
		2 marks	Collects and records secondary evidence relevant to the hypothesis in a way appropriate for the topic. Comments on the quality of the sources of secondary evidence
<b>Total marks</b>	<b>6</b>		

Part C - Conclusions

Element	Marks		Criteria
<b>Processing evidence</b>	4	0 marks	Evidence is not processed
		1–2 marks	a) Attempts to process all collected evidence, using appropriate mathematical skills b) Attempts to present the processed evidence in a way appropriate for the topic
		3–4 marks	a) Processes all collected evidence in a way that is appropriate to the task, using appropriate mathematical skills b) Presents processed evidence in a way that allows conclusions to be drawn
<b>Quality of evidence</b>	4	0 marks	Makes no comments on the quality of the evidence
		1–2 marks	a) Comments on the quality of the primary evidence, dealing with anomalies appropriately (if no anomalies in evidence candidates need to state this) b) Comments on the quality of the secondary evidence, dealing with anomalies appropriately (if no anomalies in evidence candidates need to state this)
		3–4 marks	a) Explains any adjustments to the evidence needed, or decision not to exclude evidence b) Takes account of anomalies in primary and secondary evidence when processing evidence (using all evidence if no anomalies)

Element	Marks		Criteria
<b>Conclusions based on evidence</b>	6	0 marks	Makes no relevant conclusions
		1–2 marks	a) Provides a conclusion based on all collected evidence, but does not link it to the hypothesis b) Attempts to explain the conclusion using all collected evidence, including appropriate mathematical relationships
		3–4 marks	a) Provides a conclusion which refers to the hypothesis based on all collected evidence b) Explains the conclusion using the evidence, including appropriate mathematical relationships
		5–6 marks	a) Provides a conclusion which refers to the hypothesis based on all collected evidence and relevant scientific ideas b) Explains the conclusion using relevant scientific ideas and all collected evidence, including appropriate mathematical relationships
<b>Evaluation of conclusion</b>	4	0 marks	Makes no relevant evaluation
		1–2 marks	a) Evaluates conclusion based on all collected evidence b) Suggests how all collected evidence can be improved to provide stronger support for the conclusion
		3–4 marks	a) Evaluates conclusion based on all collected evidence and relevant scientific ideas b) Suggests how all collected evidence can be improved and extended to provide stronger support for the conclusion

Element	Marks		Criteria
<b>Evaluation of method</b>	6	0 marks	Makes no relevant evaluation
		1-2 marks	a) Identifies a strength or weakness in the method b) Suggests how to improve method and justifies comments made
		3-4 marks	a) Describes strengths or weaknesses in the method and reasons for any anomalies b) Suggests how to improve method and justifies comments made relating to the quality of the evidence collected (including reasons for anomalies)
		5-6 marks	a) Describes strengths and weaknesses in the method and relates them to the hypothesis, and reasons for any anomalies b) Suggests how to improve method, justifying comments made relating to the hypothesis and how better quality evidence could be produced (including reasons for anomalies)
<b>Total marks</b>	<b>24</b>		