University of Southampton | **School of Physics & Astronomy** | **PHYS6006 Progress Report Marking Checklist**

This should be filled in and freely annotated by a Project Supervisor when assessing a student's final-year project Progress Report. Students were asked to submit their reports by 9th January: so please aim to complete this form by **Friday 31st January** or if possible sooner. Please send your report to the faculty assessment team (pa-studentoffice@soton.ac.uk) (so that we can retain the marks) and also give a copy to your students at the same time.

Student's Name....James Plank.....

Title of Project....Magnetospheric structure – high latitude auroras.....

Supervisor.....Dr Robert Fear.....

Early in semester 2 all the information entered on this form should be discussed in detail between the Supervisor and the student.

Section 1: general questions

Hazard Assessment: if appropriate, has a hazard assessment form been completed?

Bench Inspection: if appropriate, is the experimental area being maintained in a clean and tidy state, and are there any problems with equipment or materials?

Resources: has the student encountered any special obstacles in obtaining suitable equipment, computing facilities, library resources, etc? Is so, have those obstacles now been overcome?

Log Book: is the student's log book properly kept, and is it (as far as you know) an accurate record of what the student has done?

Work: is the student putting sufficient time and effort into the project?

Section 2: the Progress Report

Has the Report been produced in the required format? (2000 words in length, plus references, in a black-and-white 12-point font on A4 paper, etc. etc. as described on the PHYS6006 Blackboard site). If there are equations, diagrams, graphs or tables, have they been properly produced? Are numerical quantities correctly quoted with appropriate units, errors, etc? Is the overall layout satisfactory?

Is the English satisfactory? (Style, grammar, punctuation and spelling)

Very important: is the Progress Report consistent with the log book and factually accurate in its description of the student's activities and achievements?

Does the Report include:

- A brief but clear introduction and a statement of the aims of the project?
- An indication of the division of labour (if two students are working in partnership) and a sufficiently detailed statement of how the student's time has been spent?
- An account of initial literature searching, planning or design work, initial calculations or preliminary results?
- An account of what has been achieved, indicating what this particular student has personally achieved (if two students are working in partnership)?
- A good list of relevant and selectively-chosen references in a suitable and consistent format?

Does the Progress Report show that the student has

- Understood the relevant basic physics at MPhys level?
- Begun to acquire relevant specialist knowledge at or beyond MPhys level?
- Acquired competence in experimental, mathematical and/or computing skills (as appropriate)?
- Analysed and interpreted theories or pre-existing data or preliminary results (if any) satisfactorily?
- Made realistic plans for the remainder of the year?

A percentage mark should be given according to the usual standards (70+ = First, 60-69 = Upper Second, 50-59 = Lower Second, 40-49 = Third, 35-39 = Pass, 0-34 = Fail).

It is suggested that the Supervisor should use the 10 bullet points above as a basis for marking, the ten points being of roughly equal importance.

Please note the three questions at the foot of the previous page. The mark should be scaled down if the Report is incorrectly produced (up to 20% scaledown), in poor English (up to 20% scaledown) or factually inaccurate/misleading (100% scaledown for a tissue of lies).

Mark awarded (%): 68

Feedback to student:

This report details some very good progress made over the first semester.

There are a couple of slight inaccuracies in the background information, but this will hopefully become clearer to you as you take PHYS6004! Also please note the distinction between statistical/case studies of transpolar acs (which have been done before) and of the magnetotail structure associated with those arcs (which is what you are doing, and has not been done statistically before).

The Introduction and Observations (more accurately titled 'Instrumentation' or 'Data sets') sections were very good. The results section became a bit tricky to follow – Figure 7 was a little tricky to follow and Figure 9 (which should be the main figure of interest in this report) was barely explained, and no conclusions were drawn. It would have been good to have heard a bit about your preliminary conclusions on this data, and maybe a little bit more about your future plans. For your final report, it would be advisable to separate out your 'results' and 'discussion' sections.

A few minor language points – see annotated comments, but in particular "the solar wind" is usually written in the singular, and 'Sun' is usually capitalised as a proper noun.