

Das Neves Rodrigues, Nat

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 November 2016 22:49
To: Das Neves Rodrigues, Nat
Subject: Re: P1 article assessment [REDACTED]

Dear Nat,

Thank you for getting back to me with lots of feedback. I will use these comments to help me with future essays.

Many Thanks,
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

On 29 Nov 2016, at 21:19, Das Neves Rodrigues, Nat <N.das-Neves-Rodrigues@warwick.ac.uk> wrote:

Hello [REDACTED]

Tried to start on a positive note, encouraging the student to not give up and keep working on improving, while also acknowledging my own responsibility in the

I am sorry you were disappointed with your mark. Getting an assignment not quite right can happen, especially if you are not sure or unclear what is being asked of you. I will make a note to myself to try and be more specific in the future. But for now please do not worry too much - one not-so-good mark only points out where there is room for improvement and, therefore, and given you put the work in, you can recover easily in future assignments. To help you with this, I'll try and give you a bit more feedback:

Your first mistake was format based: the article was to be one A4 page long, and you have 2 pages. I know it sounds pedantic, but these types of restrictions will be present in your academic and professional career, and **you need to get used to present your ideas concisely, using formatting to your best advantage** (for example the font you chose uses way too much space and your first figure takes up almost a quarter of the space you had!). The next format mistake is that, this being an essay or article, it shouldn't really be separate in "sections" or "chapters" - you should be able to make your text flow without these aids. **I**

Guidance on good practice and learning outcomes.

Acknowledging students' individual needs/difficulties. **understand there might be a language barrier,** and so this was not really something I took marks for, but there is certainly room for improvement. On that note, you also wrote "How OCT works?", when **the correct form is "How does OCT work?"**. This is totally language based, but **the way you use language affects how well you communicate your science so, once again, room for improvement.**

Explaining the relevance of learning outcomes.

In terms of content, your introduction was not very good. However, you made a mistake that I see students making a lot for this assignment: they introduce interferometry in the limited scope of the P1 experiment, rather than as a technique in itself. **What I mean by that is** that the introduction should have more of "interferometry is blah blah blah; the first interferometry experiment was by this person who was trying to find blah blah blah. With time, interferometry has evolved into a field of its own and people have now found lots of uses for it such as blah blah blah. There are several types of interferometry such as blah blah blah". Not these words but along these lines. In the same way, no equations are needed and indeed again they take up space that could be used for useful written content.

Acknowledging good practice. **Your example is a good one and is decently explained** but again you made use of bullet points where you should have written a fluid text. Finally, in science it does not matter what you are writing: **it needs to be referenced.** The

correct way to reference is as you go, or throughout the text. That means that every time you make a statement, you include a reference. Such as: "The reason for the sky being blue is Raman scattering.¹" (where the "1" refers to the number of your reference and should be in a superscript). So you should end up with a text full of little numbers scattered all over (but in relevant places, of course). Also, when you get to list the references, there are specific formats to do it - check the Royal Society of Chemistry website for these formats.

And really, for an article like this you should have consulted more than one single source. This is an exercise to get you into the habit of researching papers, reading papers, working on them. Oh, and references are also needed in captions for your figures, so that you indicate where you got your figures from!

As a final note, fair game for putting the effort in and drawing a figure yourselves (I am assuming you drew figure 1), but a scanned figure like that does not look very professional. The hint here is that you do the same thing, but use Power Point. I use it all the time for actual publication figures and it works fine!

I think these were the main things, and I am sure I have given you plenty to read! By the way, I don't mean to start some sort of competition but if you want to read an article that got a good mark, and see how it differs from yours, just ask around your colleagues to see if they would be happy to share. We can all learn a lot from each other! And please, don't be let down by this - it is your first year in uni and you have a lot to learn; wanting to do better and putting the effort in is much more than halfway on your way to success.

I hope this reply is what you were looking for, anything else you need just let me know and I'll do my best to help.

Pointing towards useful resources.

Cheers,
Nat

Encouraging further work and showing availability for further feedback.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 November 2016 18:38:07
To: Das Neves Rodrigues, Nat
Subject: P1 article assessment [REDACTED]

Dear Nat,

We have just received our P1 article assessment grades back and were disappointed with our grade after we thought we had met the criteria. My partner and I were just wondering if there is any further feedback that you could give us maybe some annotations on our article to show us which bits we should have done differently.

Many Thanks,
[REDACTED]