Scale	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Mark /10 for this criterion
Calculation of ground state energy [Weighted at 10%]	Not calculated				Major error in calculation that should have been spotted and corrected.		Minor error in calculation					Correctly and efficiently calculated using Runge Kutta methods as used in previous sessions, and fully explained	
Calculation of ground state wavefunction [Weighted at 5%]	Not calculated				Major error in calculation that should have been spotted and corrected.		Minor error in calculation					Correctly and efficiently calculated and normalised, with complete text cell explanations	
Comparison with analytical results [Weighted at 5%]	Not compared				Compared and found to be different, without explanation or commentary							Fully compared and verified	
Excited state wavefunctions and energies [Weighted at 10%]	Not calculated				Major error or omission in calculation or interpretation.		Minor error, eg valid wavefunctions but not those for n = 2, 3, 4, or minor omission		Correctly calculated, but … [REDACTED]		[REDACTED]		
Large n excited states [Weighted at 2%]	Not calculated					Calculated but with errors or wrong interpretation						At least two high-energy states (18 ≤ n ≤ 28) calculated correctly and verified, with the value of n explicitly checked.	
Embedded harmonic potential [Weighted at 10%]	Not calculated				Major error or omisson in calculation or interpretation.		Minor errors or omissions, or omissions / misunderstanding in the interpretation of the results		Correctly calculated for both ground state and low-lying excited states, fully compared qualitatively with analytical harmonic potential results.		Also compared quantitatively with analytical harmonic potential results, with fully complete and correct interpretation and discussion	
Embedded finite square well [Weighted at 10%]	Not calculated				Major error or omission in calculation or interpretation.		Minor errors or omissions, or omissions / misunderstanding in the interpretation of the results		Correctly calculated for both ground state and low-lying excited states, fully compared qualitatively with analytical finite square results.		[REDACTED]		
Own choice of potential [Weighted at 10%]	Not calculated			Major error in calculation or interpretation.		Poor choice, or minor calculation / interpretation errors.		Generally sensible choice, correctly calculated and well-interpreted.			[REDACTED]		
Units (overall - missing units will also be penalised in the relevant section) [Weighted at 3%]	No units present!				Most units missing /wrong		Mostly present and correct, but a few units missing or wrong.				Units are present and correct throughout in both text cells and code comments		
Overall quality of plots [Weighted at 10%]	No plots produced by the submitted code.			Inadequate plots - for example, frequent missing axis labels or titles.		Most but not all requirements of the plots met - for example, occasional missing legends, or errors in the axis labels/title		All plot requirements met: everything is clearly plotted and correctly and appropriately labelled.			[REDACTED]	
Overall quality of code style [Weighted at 5%]	Code would require significant correction before it can be run.			Code has errors (requiring the marker to correct it before it can be run) - for example an undefined variable or code cells wrongly ordered.		The code runs with no errors, but is somewhat inefficient or poorly structured, or has a poor choice of variable names		Code is clear, follows best practice guidelines, with a good effort made to ensure appropriate variable names and efficiency of calculation. Runs without errors or warnings.			[REDACTED]	
Overall quality of the commenting in the code cells [Weighted at 5%]	No comments are included			Significant lack of useful comments in the submitted code.	Missing some/all docstrings in functions	Code is undercommented, unnecessarily verbose, or so unnecessarily overcommented that readability is affected. Nonetheless, the comments remain decipherable and are of some use.		Code is clearly and appropriately commented. Complicated parts of code have a higher level of commenting than simpler parts. Coded pasted/repurposed from other sources is clearly referenced as such.			[REDACTED]	
Overall quality of text cells and discussion [Weighted at 12%]	Text cells have not been included			Not enough text cells included to create a self-contained document, or poor quality, for example grammatical/linguistic errors severely affecting the readability of the commentary.		Acceptable commentary, but needs expansion in several areas.		A clear, self-contained document. Text cells consist of complete, well-structured and grammatical paragraphs. It is clear what the student is calculating, how they are going about it, and why they are doing it. A clear understanding of the physics of the problem is demonstrated.			[REDACTED]	
Referencing and Bibliography [Weighted at 3%]	Bibliography is missing			Bibliography is present but is lacking multiple sources, and/or citations are missing in the text cell discussion		The bibliography is present, contains all relevant sources, and is cited at the appropriate points in the text throughout.		In addition, the sources included in the bibliography indicate the student has read around the topics more widely and has selected key relevant sources to include and cite.			[REDACTED]	
											TOTAL (/100)		