### Assessment criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage of the topic</strong></td>
<td>Only superficial coverage of the topic or narrowly focused on one</td>
<td>Covers most of the topic and considers at least one subtopic in more</td>
<td>Covers breadth of topic, or only misses a minor area. Some topics</td>
<td>Covers the full breadth of the designated topic, with main points to as much deep as a lay person could</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subtopic. May focus heavily on the biology at the expense of the</td>
<td>detail. Mentions relevant anatomy, physiology and related biomedical</td>
<td>in more depth. Describes relevant anatomy and physiology and related</td>
<td>be expected to grasp. Addresses relevant anatomy &amp; physiology (normal and abnormal) and related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>engineering, or vice versa.</td>
<td>biomedical engineering.</td>
<td>biomedical engineering.</td>
<td>biomedical engineering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of external material</strong></td>
<td>Poor choice of external material which does not reliably support/illustrate text. A collection of vaguely related materials. Overly reliant on a small number of texts, or sources considered to be of low academic integrity.</td>
<td>External material cited but excessive/imbalance of quoted material relative to own work and/or material does not reliably support/illustrate text. A reasonable range of material used.</td>
<td>Appropriate and complements own work. Always cited and used legally. Materials used indicate that a careful search has been conducted and the most suitable items used.</td>
<td>Appropriate, carefully chosen to illustrate topic, complements own work, always clearly cited, and used in accordance with the items copyright status. Indicative of a thorough literature search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic quality and readability</strong></td>
<td>Some structure, but material may be disjointed and presentation inappropriate or inconsistent. Level may be patronisingly simple or suitable only for experts in the field. Use of English weak or with significant spelling mistakes.</td>
<td>Structure logical, but layout may be awkward or presentation may be poor. Occasional spelling mistakes or poor use of English. Level may be a little above or below target audience, so as to make it hard for the reader to engage.</td>
<td>Generally attractive to look at with clear layout of content. Good use of English with few errors. At approximately the right level for the target audience.</td>
<td>Logically structured layout draws reader in. Good balance of text and figures. Excellent use of English language, grammar, and spelling; well proofread. Language and assumed prior knowledge appropriate for intended readership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced writing skills: writing for the web</strong></td>
<td>Minimal or clumsy use of wiki features. Looks as if copy and pasted from e.g. ‘Word’ – possible resulting in unnecessary big files.</td>
<td>Includes links, but some may be broken or inappropriate. Non-standard characters may not be displayed correctly.</td>
<td>Embedded links are present, neat and functional. Images and formatting are used effectively. Some non-standard characters and/or formatting have been used.</td>
<td>Contains working embedded internal and external links, with user friendly wording. Excellent use of images and formatting. Subscripts, superscripts, and/or special characters are used and display correctly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>