

PHYS 590 Midyear Report Marking Template

1. Abstract

Absent	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
0	0.5	0.75	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract is absent Abstract does not convey the essence of the report. The abstract is too long and/or includes technical details 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract clearly and concisely presents the essential elements and key results contained in the paper. 	

2. Introduction

Absent	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
0	0.5	0.75	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction is absent Introduction in language that has too much technical detail and jargon. Description of topic is incomplete Objective is vague or incomplete The link to the larger context is absent or unclear. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction is easily understood by a scientifically literate university audience. Description of motivation, context and approach are clear and concise. Link to the larger context is clearly identified. 	

3. Scientific Understanding

Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
1	3	4	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor understanding of subject matter. Unable to explain many of the key elements of the project. Student has a very narrow view of the topic being investigated. Project understood at a mechanistic level, with limited understanding of the scientific justification for the steps being undertaken. Body of knowledge inadequately discussed. Physics issues and challenges not well identified or discussed. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows excellent grasp of the science and is able to describe the essential elements of the project very well. Physical motivation for key project methodologies well understood and explained. Student demonstrates a good understanding of the field in the broader sense. Physics issues and challenges identified and understood 	

4. Progress on Project

Insufficient	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
1	3	4	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited progress on project, path to completion unclear. Work lacking in initiative and/or insightfulness. Future plan not clearly based on a good understanding of the work required. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good progress on project clearly displayed, project is on a good path. Work is insightful, personal “ownership” of the project clearly demonstrated. Student is “driving” the project. Future plan well thought out and realistic in scope/schedule. 	

5. Conclusion

Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
0	0.5	0.75	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusions, implications, and/or consequences lacking or underdeveloped. Significance of what may be discovered, learned, developed or produced is unclear. Assertions are unqualified or unwarranted. The linkage to future work and the broader context is absent or underdeveloped. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conclusions, including any qualifications, are presented and well developed. The significance of the science potential is clearly described. Assertions are well supported. The linkage to future work and broader context are clear. 	

6. Overall Report Quality

Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
1	3	4	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organization is clumsy or mechanical, no logical flow between report components. Project methodology poorly described, essential elements not clearly distinguished. Language obscures meaning/unclear in places. Grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors are numerous and distracting. Readability is limited. Report does not observe rules for length and/or layout. Tables and figures not relevant and/or are missing components and/or are illegible. Sources not cited or not used correctly. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well structured, with logical flow between report components. Body of knowledge thoroughly, but concisely discussed. Project methodology well described, and context given. The report correctly identifies and focuses on the most relevant information, weeding out the less relevant material. Language is eloquent and clearly and effectively communicates ideas. Only minor typographical errors. Report is of prescribed length and format. Tables and figures relevant and legible with appropriate and complete axes, labels, legends and captions. Sources and citations are adequate and used correctly. 	

7. Examiner's Discretion:

Examiners may add up to an additional two marks to bring the overall project mark up to the appropriate level. For reference, Queen's grade descriptors are:

Mark (/20) Greater Than:	Letter Grade	Descriptor
18	A+	Exceptional
17	A	Outstanding
16	A-	Excellent
15.4	B+	Very Good
14.6	B	Good
14	B-	Reasonably Good
13.4	C+	Acceptable
12	C, C-	Minimally Acceptable
10	D+, D, D-	Unsatisfactory Pass
<10	F	Fail