**Grading Rubric**

***Lab 1 – Capacitance***

***( /38)***

Recall that your goal is to teach them through inquiry-based teaching, and therefore you should encourage discussions, and make them understand the concepts (and achieve the best marks possible) as opposed to strictly evaluating them. You should try and assess their understanding in the last 30 mins of the lab session, or before they leave.

**Pre-lab (/2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Unsatisfactory (0) | Minimalist (1) | Satisfactory (2) | Exceeding (3) |
| Pre-lab Activity | Did not attempt any of them | Gave an answer to all of them. Made some mistakes. | Gave an answer to all of them. Made no mistakes | - |

**Session a**

No grading for this session.

**Session b**

**Conceptual questions and Critical thinking (/20)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Unsatisfactory (0) | Minimalist (2) | Satisfactory (4) | Exceeding (6) |
| Adjusted their initial proposal from the end of Session a after the group discussion. | After the group discussion, they still do not understand that they must vary the distance and area between the plates. |  | Intend to study the effect of and on the capacitance by following the expected protocol. | Offered an unexpected method to further test the effect of , or on the capacitance. |
| Responded to their observations from the previous lab. | Made observations in Session a, but did not correct for them in the Session b | Responded to some observations. | Responded to all observations. | Proposed a better approach than the expected protocol. |
| Observed that the capacitance is proportional to the area of the plates. | Did no observe this. | Observed it, but their data is inconclusive. | Observed it and obtained good data. Or obtained bad data but were able to justify their sources of error. | - |
| Observed that the capacitance is inversely proportional to the distance between the plates. | Did not observe this. | Observed it, but their data is inconclusive. | Observed it and obtained good data. Or obtained bad data but were able to justify their sources of error. | Observed that there for large enough distances, there is a correction that deviates from . Attempted to give an explanation to this correction. |
| Gave a physical explanation why area and the distance affected the capacitance of the setup. | Did not answer the question | Answered the question, but the answer was inadequate. | Has the correct answer | Exceeded expectations by making connections to other topics. |

**Data presentation (/16)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Unsatisfactory (0) | Minimalist (1) | Satisfactory (2) |
| Appropriate algebra (includes appropriate error propagation calculations) | Overwhelming number of mistakes | Roughly half the calculations are wrong | Most calculations are correct |
| Units (results and graphs) | Missing | Incorrectly used | Correctly used |
| Standard deviation  and significant figures | Missing | Incorrectly used | Correctly used |
| Title (figures and tables) | Missing | Incorrectly used | Correctly used |
| Axes labels | Missing | Incorrectly used | Correctly used |
| Error bars on graphs | Missing | Incorrectly used | Correctly used |
| Fit equation for graphs | Missing | Incorrectly used | Correctly used |
| value for graphs | Missing | Incorrectly used | Correctly used |

**Bonus points:**

* Fixed a known technical issue with the setup **(+2)**.
* Improved the Arduino code **(+2)**.
* Discusses the mathematical description of the electric field between the parallel plates (in comparison with that of an electric charge) **(+1)**.