Structures report grading sheet 2020

The table below is the grading rubrics used for the structures report for the AE3212-II SVV Structural Analysis assignment. The grade for the structures report is calculated by dividing the weighted average of the categories listed in the table below by 10. The partial weight of each category is given in the table.

Please note, that partial grades per category can be given as well, as it can happen that for a given category a structures report is best described by recombining the descriptions listed in two or more columns. Should this happen, a grade will be given that is the average between the columns, e.g. if the report fits both column 70 and column 80 for a given category, the resulting partial score will be 75.

Please note, that due to the digital implementation of the grading rubrics only the following partial grades can be issued per category: 0, 20, 40, 50, 60, 65, 70, 75, 80, 90, 100.

	0	40	60	70	80	100
Report Overview 5%	Task division missing	Report is not structured	Structure sufficient	Good structure	Good structure and layout, references included	Very good structure and layout, textbook style, including referencing
		Many incorrect sentences	Several spelling and grammatical errors	Minor spelling and grammatical errors	Few spelling and grammatical errors	No spelling and grammatical errors
		Task division incomplete	Task division present, but needs revision	Clear task division present	Very clear task division present	Exemplary task division present
Verification Model 10%	Description of method missing	Description of method partly missing or contains fundamental mistakes	Small parts of the method contain small mistakes and no or wrong motivation for why this is a good model to verify the numerical model	Description of method correct and some motivation is given for why this is a good model to verify the numerical model	Clear, complete description of the method and good motivation for why this is a good model to verify the numerical model	Clear, concise, unambiguous description of the method, and motivation as in textbook for why this is a good model to verify the numerical model
		Missing all main assumptions made by verification model or wrong assumptions mentioned	A few main assumptions made by verification model identified	Most main assumptions made by verification model identified	Main assumptions made by verification model identified	All assumptions made in verification model correctly identified
	Results of verification model missing	Results of verification model contain mistakes or have been misinterpreted	Results of verification model are included, improvement possible in presentation of results	Results of verification model are included, results are clearly presented	Results of verification model are included, results are very clearly presented	Results of verification model are included, presentation of results exemplary
Numerical Model 25%	Assumptions and effects missing	Missing all main assumptions or wrong assumptions mentioned	A few main assumptions are given	Most main assumptions are given	Main assumptions are complete	Assumptions show creativity beyond what can be expected
		Effects of assumptions are not described	Effects of assumptions is included for some assumptions and/or often flawed motivation for effects	Effects of assumptions is included for most assumptions and/or some lapses in motivation for effects	Effects of assumption is included for all assumptions and nearly always sound motivation for effects	Effect on results and motivation show creativity beyond what can be expected
		Validity of assumptions is not justified	Justification of validity of assumption is included for some assumptions and/or often flawed	Justification of validity of assumption is included for most assumptions and/or some lapses in justification	Justification of validity of assumption is included for all assumptions and is nearly always sound	Justification of validity of assumptions shows creativity beyond what can be expected
	Structural model missing	Structural model contains fundamental mistakes and/or is incomplete and/or motivation is incomplete	Structural model contains some mistakes and/or missing some motivation	Structural model contains only minor mistakes, motivation is more than sufficient	Structural model contains no mistakes and with good motivation	Structural model contains no mistakes, is coherent with very good motivation, as in a textbook
	Numerical methods not specified	Numerical methods contain fundamental mistakes and/or are incomplete and/or motivation is incomplete	Numerical methods contain some mistakes and/or missing some motivation	Numerical methods contain only minor mistakes, motivation more than sufficient	Numerical methods contain no mistakes and with good motivation	Numerical methods contain no mistakes, is coherent with very good motivation, as in a textbook
	No results given	Results are inconsistent with model or are incomplete	Results are consistent with model, improvement possible in presentation of results	Results are consistent with model, results are clearly presented	Results are consistent with model, results are very clearly presented	Results are consistent with model, presentation of results exemplary
						Structural model and/or numerical method is tailored to reach high accuracy

Verification 35%	No unit tests	One unit test given, or several unspecific unit tests given	Several specific unit tests performed, but with mistakes and/or with little diversity	Several specific unit tests performed with no mistakes and sufficient diversity	Several specific unit tests are performed with no mistakes and more than sufficient diversity, and are well described	Performed unit tests good, creativity shown in finding tests
	No larger (system) tests	Larger (system) test not specific or not complete	Larger (system) test relevant but with mistakes	Multiple larger (system) tests are all relevant	Multiple larger (system) tests are all relevant and well described	Multiple larger (system) tests are all relevant, creativity shown in designing tests
	No description of the accuracy of the tests	Accuracy of at least one test given	Accuracy of tests given, but with mistakes	Accuracy of tests given with some motivation	Accuracy of tests given and motivated	Accuracy of tests given and motivated as in a textbook
	No discussion of the coverage of the tests, and tests do not cover entire model	Tests only compare numerical and verification model with each other	Tests cover only small parts of the model	Tests cover significant parts of the model	Tests cover the model completely	A strong effort has been made to show that the tests covers the model entirely
	No results given	Results are inconsistent with described verification tests	Results are consistent with described verification tests, improvement possible in presentation of results	Results are consistent with described verification tests, results are clearly presented	Results are consistent with described verification tests, results are very clearly presented	Results are consistent with described verification tests, results are clearly presented
	Discrepancies are not resolved					
Validation 25%	Performed validation tests missing	Performed validation tests contain mistakes and/or not clearly defined and/or incomplete	Performed validation tests sufficient, but with minor errors or missing description, inefficient use of validation data	Performed validation tests more than sufficient, room for improvement in efficiency of use of validation data	Performed validation tests good, well described. Validation data is efficiently used	Performed validation tests good, creativity shown, very well described. Validation data is optimally used
	Discrepancies not addressed	Discrepancies wrongly addressed or explained	Effort is made to address or explain discrepancies but some mistakes	Discrepancies sufficiently addressed or explained. Effort is made to relate it to assumptions and data	Discrepancies are addressed or explained and related to assumptions or accuracy in model and data	Discrepancies are assessed fully consistently with description of assumptions and their effects, and the uncertainty in validation data