

Table 10.1: Markscheme for your log-books.

Item			
Administrative			
Full name on book?	No: 0 Marks	Initials only: 1 Mark	Yes: 2 Marks
E-mail and department so it can be returned if lost?	No: 0 Marks	Missing email address or Department: 1 Mark	Yes: 2 Marks
Loose leaf paper?	Yes lots: 0 Marks	A few bits: 1 Mark	None: 2 Marks
Contents (front or back) (pages, experiment name/number, date)?	No: 0 Marks	Partially: 1 Mark	Yes: 2 Marks
Page numbers on each page?	No: 0 Marks	Partially or illegible: 1 Mark	Yes: 2 Marks
Each page dated at the top?	No: 0 Marks	Partially or illegible: 1 Mark	Yes: 2 Marks
New page taken at the beginning of a new day?	No: 0 Marks	Yes: 1 Mark	

Item				
Writing legible?	No: 0 Marks	Mostly illegible: 2 Marks	Can be read but sometimes tricky: 4 Marks	Easy to read 6 Marks
Each page dated at the top?	No: 0 Marks	Incomplete or illegible: 1 Mark	Yes: 2 Marks	
Completed and reasonable self-assessment?	No: 0 Marks	Many items not scored or obviously not a reasonable attempt: 2 Marks	Some items not scored: 4 Marks	Yes: 6 Marks
Some evidence of pre-session activity, e.g., similar to pre-session assessment. Marks for logical sense and understandability, can be cut 'n' paste from a typed document? No: 0 Marks	A simple copy of the experimental script: 4 Marks	Some attempt over a simple regurgitation of the experimental scrip, but not much evidence of actual thought: 8 Marks	Nicely written summary as requested for the pre-session summaries activity: 12 Marks	
Diagrams				

Item				
Good use of diagrams/sketches?	No diagrams: 0 Marks	Perhaps a poor sketch or two: 1 Mark	Some nice sketches, but perhaps too few or too scrappy: 2 Marks	Well drawn sketches that allow easy reading of log-book: 3 Marks
Clear diagrams?	No diagrams: 0 Marks	Poorly drawn: 1 Mark	Good attempt and may be useful to the author, but perhaps not so useful to the casual observer: 2 Marks	I look and understand what's what: 3 Marks
Well labelled diagrams?	No diagrams: 0 Marks	Some attempt at a label, but not clear: 1 Mark	Nice label: 2 Marks	Excellent just like a figure caption: 3 Marks
Tables				
Good use of dimensionless heading?	No tables or no headings: 0 Marks	Some attempt, but perhaps not consistent or illegible: 1 Mark	Good effort, but some room for improvement: 2 Marks	Excellent, as requested: 3 Marks

Item				
Clear accompanying explanation to table what is being recorded and which values are raw values?	No table or no associated explanation: 0 Marks	An effort at an explanation, but so brief as to be not useful for the reader: 2 Marks	Clear explanation, clear indication of raw values, but to the reader could be more clear: 4 Marks	Reads like report: 6 Marks
Clear indication of where raw uncertainty arises?	No: 0 Marks	Some attempt made but on the whole not helpful to the reader: 1 Mark	Some indication, but perhaps not as clear as it could be: 2 Marks	Clear description maths if needed: 3 Marks
Clear indication of how uncertainty on final processed number arises?	No: 0 Marks	Some attempt made but it's not clear what it entails. Perhaps illegible, or lacking textual description: 2 Marks	A decent attempt but perhaps scrappy or missing an element: 4 Marks	Yes, logical description and step by step mathematical: 6 Marks

Item				
Clear link to computer file?	No link given: 0 Marks	Some evidence of a link: 1 Mark	Good but probably still insufficient for a reader to find the file: 2 Marks	Very clear unambiguous link to University system: 3 Marks
Graphs				
Graph included?	No graphs at all: 0 Marks	A poor graph: 2 Marks	A nice graph: 4 Marks	Has excellent graph: 6 Marks
Title or explanatory text is descriptive and concise?	No title or text: 0 Marks	Some evidence of a title etc. but not enough, or too illegible, to understand the graph: 1 Mark	Nice title or text, but still lacking some key details, but sufficient for most uses: 2 Marks	Very clear or text, making graph easy to understand to the reader: 3 Marks
Labelled axes?	No graph or axis not labelled: 0 Marks	Hints at a label, but not useful: 1 Mark	Axis labelled, perhaps one or two missing, or poorly written: 2 Marks	All axes appropriately labelled: 3 Marks

Item				
Correct use of dimensionless units?	No graph, or no attempt at dimensionless units: 0 Marks	Some evidence but too scrappy or incorrect to be useful: 1 Mark	Some good use of dimensionless units, but some could be better: 2 Marks	Excellent of dimensionior units on a axis: 3 Marks
Indication of error bars?	No graphs, or no error bars: 0 Marks	Some minor attempt at error bars: 1 Mark	Nice error bars, but perhaps non-physical or a few missing or no text description: 2 Marks	Excellent bars, with explanatic 3 Marks
Clarity				
Good use of space?	No, all compressed together: 0 Marks	Occasionally starts on a new page, but experiments run into each other, or hard to tell the start or end of a section: 1 Marks	Some good use of space to ensure an easily digested book, but still some room for improvement: 2 Marks	A very cle and well l out log-bo 3 Marks

Item				
No overwrites and no tippex?	Evidence of much tippex or overwriting: 0 Marks	Some bits seem confused by overwriting of tippexing: 1 Marks	A few bits seem confused by overwriting of tippexing: 2 Marks	None observed: 3 Marks
Descriptive notes in plain English as to what's what?	No, text at all, just tables and numbers etc: 0 Marks	Evidence of patch attempts to string together some textual narrative: 3 Marks	Some description, but could be, illegible, too long, or too short: 6 Marks	Lovely description not overly verbose enough to know what: 9 Marks
No pencil (except graphs and diagrams)?	Any evidence of pencil at all (except graphs and diagrams): 0 Marks	No evidence of pencil (except graphs and diagrams): 3 Marks		
Completion				
Did the student fully complete the experiment?	Not much reported: 0 Marks	Some effort at analysis: 5 Marks	Good effort, nearly complete, but no conclusions: 10 Marks	As competent experimenter can be as for: 15 Marks