Comp Phys B report marking scheme
Marks will be allocated in the four categories shown below.

	Presentation (25 marks)	**Background and context** (10 marks)	**Achievement** (35 marks)	**Analysis and scientific understanding** (30 marks)	**Comments**
80%+	✓ Negligible spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors ✓ Exemplary writing style; lively and articulate writing, showing excellent command of technical terminology and strong arguments ✓ Entirely succinct, clear and precise descriptions and explanations ✓ Excellent presentation, layout and formatting; coherent and logical structure ✓ Creative use of well designed and relevant figures and/or tables ✓ Perfect formatting of figures and/or tables, equations and references ✓ Excellent linkage of the text with figures, tables and equations	✓ Excellent description of the project's objectives, its context and any applications of the work ✓ Excellent description of physical background to the project, at a level exactly appropriate for the audience	✓ Student achieved much more than would normally be expected ✓ Evidence in report of excellent computational skills ✓ Excellent quality and quantity of results, presented clearly ✓ Evidence of creativity, innovation and initiative, as well as industriousness	✓ Insightful critical assessment, with an excellent discussion of the advantages and limitations of the techniques used ✓ Excellent analysis of the results, including comparisons with relevant theoretical or experimental results ✓ Errors and uncertainties treated and discussed entirely rigorously and appropriately ✓ Clear, justifiable and complete conclusions, with suggestions for the future development of the project	very good work, very creative use of simulation and computing tools
70-79%	➢ Very few spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors ➢ Very good writing style ➢ Nearly all descriptions and explanations are succinct, clear and precise ➢ Very good presentation, layout and formatting; coherent and logical structure ➢ Well designed and relevant figures and/or tables ➢ Very good formatting of figures and/or tables, equations and references ➢ Text links well with figures, tables and equations	➢ Very good description of the project's objectives, its context and any applications of the work ➢ Very good description of physical background to the project	➢ Student achieved more than would normally be expected ➢ Evidence in report of very strong computational skills ➢ Very good quality and quantity of results, presented clearly ➢ Evidence of some creativity, innovation and initiative, as well as industriousness	➢ Strong critical assessment, with a very good discussion of the advantages and limitations of the techniques used ➢ Very good analysis of the results, including comparisons with relevant theoretical or experimental results ➢ Very good treatment and discussion of errors and uncertainties ➢ Clear, justifiable and complete conclusions	very nice set of experiments and results 2 pages of appendices is at the limit when appendices are excessively used bit of physics missing: few real-life examples of DLAs would have been good to mention, and what sticking probability means in physics terms
60-69%	➢ A few spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors ➢ Good writing style ➢ Most descriptions and explanations are succinct, clear and precise ➢ Good presentation, layout and formatting; coherent and logical structure ➢ Generally well designed and relevant figures and/or tables ➢ Good formatting of figures and/or tables, equations and references ➢ Text mostly links well with figures, tables and equations	➢ ✓ Good description of the project's aims & objectives, its context and any applications of the work ➢ ✓ Good description of physical background to the project	➢ Student achieved as much as would normally be expected ➢ Evidence of good computational skills ➢ Good quality and quantity of results, presented clearly	➢ Clear discussion of the advantages and limitations of the techniques used ➢ Good analysis of the results, including comparisons with relevant theoretical or experimental results ➢ Good treatment and discussion of errors and uncertainties ➢ Clear and justifiable conclusions	objectives of the work should have been clearly stated in the introduction good structure but could be bit more streamlined: e.g. results section contained some discussion (consider "results & discussion" section)
50-59%	➢ Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar ➢ Reasonably good writing style, but with some lapses into colloquialisms, inappropriate tense, mixture of writing styles ➢ Some descriptions and explanations are succinct, clear and precise, but some confusing/confused passages ➢ Satisfactory presentation, layout and formatting; structure mainly coherent and logical ➢ Satisfactory formatting of figures and/or tables, equations and references ➢ Satisfactory linkage of the text with figures, tables and equations	➢ Reasonable description of the project's objectives, its context and any applications of the work ➢ Reasonable description of physical background to the project	➢ Student hasn't achieved quite as much as would normally be expected ➢ Evidence in report of reasonable computational skills ➢ Satisfactory quality and quantity of results	➢ Reasonable discussion of the advantages and limitations of the techniques used ➢ Satisfactory analysis of the results ➢ Errors and uncertainties treated and discussed reasonably well ➢ Conclusions reasonably clear and justifiable	limitations of square lattice simulations?
40-49%	➢ Numerous misspellings, punctuation or grammatical errors ➢ Clumsy or inappropriate writing style, often lapsing into colloquialisms, inappropriate tense, mixture of writing styles ➢ Sloppy and confusing descriptions and explanations ➢ Passable presentation, layout and formatting; structure sometimes incoherent and confused ➢ Formatting of figures and/or tables, equations and references sometimes incorrect or incomplete ➢ Text links poorly with figures, tables and equations	➢ Poor description of the project's objectives, its context and any applications of the work ➢ Poor description of physical background to the project	➢ Student hasn't achieved as much as would normally be expected ➢ Weak computational skills ➢ Poor quality and quantity of results, or results presented poorly	➢ Little or no discussion of the advantages and limitations of the techniques used ➢ Weak analysis of the results ➢ Treatment of errors and uncertainties weak or flawed ➢ Weak, unclear or unjustifiable conclusions	
<40%	➢ Riddled with spelling, punctuation or grammatical errors ➢ Totally incoherent writing style, largely incomprehensible descriptions and explanations ➢ Shoddy layout, presentation and formatting; incoherent structure ➢ Missing or incorrect formatting of figures and/or tables, equations and references ➢ Very poor or missing linkage of the text with figures, tables and equations	➢ Very weak description of the project's objectives, its context and any applications of the work ➢ Very weak description of physical background to the project	➢ Student achieved very little throughout project ➢ Very weak computational skills ➢ Very poor quality and quantity of results, or results presented very poorly	➢ Little or no discussion of the advantages and limitations of the techniques used ➢ Very weak analysis of the results ➢ Treatment of errors and uncertainties weak, flawed or missing ➢ Very weak or missing conclusions	
Comments					
Mark	21 **out of 25**	6 **out of 10**	35 **out of 35**	27 **out of 30**	

Total report mark out of 100:

Further comments: 89