Example 01 marks

**Assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **E (SL)** | **E (HL)** | **Total (SL)** | **Total (HL)** |
| Achievement level awarded | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 15 | 13 |
| Maximum possible achievement level | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 20 | 20 |

**Comments**

**Criterion A: Communication**

A2—The work is coherent but not well organized. There is no aim or rationale in the introduction.

**Criterion B: Mathematical presentation**

B3—There is good definition of terms.

**Criterion C: Personal engagement**

C3—While there was not “abundant” evidence, there was sufficient to award level 3: for example, making her own code (page 9); learning and describing unfamiliar maths; and timing herself doing the spreadsheet (page 9).

**Criterion D: Reflection**

D1—Only limited reflection, some on the significance of the timing of the spreadsheets.

**SL Criterion E: Use of mathematics**

E6—She used mathematics beyond the syllabus (derangements). Her understanding of this was verified in discussions.

**HL Criterion E: Use of mathematics**

E4—This is sophisticated but descriptive rather than rigorous mathematics.