Final Project Report Grade Sheet

The written report will constitute 60% of your final project grade.

1. Title and Authors
2:0: depending on completeness

2. Abstract
5: Clearly and briefly states the task describes the method used and presents the main results. Provides quantitative support to draw a conclusion.
4-3: Gives long-winded, confusing, or somewhat incorrect statements about the task, the method used and the main results found. Neglected to include a numeric values or includes an irrelevant result.
2-0: Does not identify either the task or the method used or the results found. Does not include any numeric values to support conclusions.

3. Introduction and general review of the method
10: Clearly and briefly states the objectives of the project including the principles examined and the basic ideas of the method used.
9-7: Gives long-winded and somewhat confusing statements for the objective of the project including the principles examined and the method used.
6-4: Gives confusing and/or somewhat incorrect statement(s) for the objectives of the project. Does not mention either the principles examined or the method used.
3-1: Does not mention neither the principles examined nor the methods used. The introduction has almost been reduced to the title of the project.
0: There is no introduction.

4. Theory behind the model used to describe the system
14-15: Clearly and briefly explains the theory behind the model, including the principles used and the equations to be solved using the appropriate level of detail.
12-13: Gives long-winded and somewhat confusing statement(s) about the theory behind the model used. Gives not enough or too many details in deriving the equations.
8-11: Gives too long or too short and somewhat incorrect statement(s) for about the theory behind the model used and the equations solved.
4-7: Gives no information about basic principles used, says something about the equations.
1-3: Gives the final equation(s) without any explanation.
0: There is no theory.

5. Review of the code used to solve the problem
14:15: Clearly and briefly explains how the code was put together. Presents clear, easily visualized picture of the steps involved in the running of the algorithm. Justifies the important steps, and (if appropriate) indicates steps that require exceptional care.
12-13: Gives too lengthy and somewhat confusing description of the code used. Indicates steps that required care. Goes into too many details.
8-11: Gives too long or too short and somewhat incorrect description of the code. Presents a possibly misleading picture of the steps involved. Possibly indicates steps that require care.
4-7: Gives some ideas of what was done with the code.
1-3: Presents snapshot of the code without any explanations.
0: There is no mention of code.

6. Review of the data received from numeric experiment
14:15: Data are organized and sorted to show interesting patterns. Calculated data are distinguished from direct experimental data. Graphs are presented with axes labeled with variable name (and unit is given in parentheses). Data points are clearly displayed on graphs. A trendline is drawn (if appropriate); the equation of the trendline is given.
12-13: Data show interesting patterns. Calculated data are distinguished from experimental data. Graphs have axes labeled. Data points are clearly displayed on graphs. A trendline is drawn (if appropriate); the equation of the trendline is given.
8-11: Data are somewhat sorted. Calculated data may be mixed with experimental data. Graph axes are vaguely labeled. A trendline is drawn (if appropriate); the equation of the trendline is given.
4-7: Data are shown without variable names and units. Calculated data may be mixed with experimental data. Graph axes are not labeled. Data points cannot be distinguished. The trendline and/or the equation of the trendline are missing.
1-3: Data? We were supposed to include numbers? A graph is missing or drawn by a squirrel.
0: No data.
7. Analysis

15: Patterns in the data are made explicit and related to predicted expectations based on the theory. The authors comment on the shape of the graph(s) and how that shape expresses the theoretical relationship. Analysis implies the conclusions in a logical progression.
14-13: Patterns in the data are made explicit and related to predicted expectations based on the theory. The authors comment on the shape of the graph(s). Analysis implies the conclusions in a logical progression.
12-10: Patterns in the data are made explicit. The authors comment on the shape of the graph(s). Analysis leads the reader close to the conclusion.
9-7: Patterns in the data are mentioned, possibly with inconsistencies. The authors comment on the graph(s). Conclusion is drawn.
6-2: There is a somewhat vague reference to the data and the graph. An important number is mentioned. An attempt is made to transition to the conclusion.
1-0: Essentially comparable to “Our data is good and consistent with the theory.”

8. Conclusion

15: The brief discussion mentions which results could justify the theory, mentions what those results are, and compares them to what the theory says they should be. If multiple aspects of the analysis support (or detract from) the theory, then each is systematically addressed, clearly indicating the validity or invalidity of the theory. Finally, an overall conclusion is drawn indicating the general validity of the theory based on the analyzed data.
14-13: The discussion mentions results that could justify the theory and compares them to what the theory says they should be. If multiple aspects of the analysis support (or detract from) the theory, then some of these are addressed, indicating the validity or invalidity of the theory. Finally, an overall conclusion is drawn indicating the general validity of the theory based on the analyzed data.
12-10: The discussion mentions results and compares them to other quantities. If multiple aspects of the analysis support (or detract from) the theory, then at least one of these is addressed. An overall conclusion is drawn.
9-7: The discussion mentions results and relates them vaguely to the theory. A possibly incorrect conclusion is drawn.
6-2: No results are mentioned and the conclusion seems unrelated to the important point of the project.
1-0: The authors draw a conclusion about the ease of the project.


8: Report was organized into proper sections with ideas clearly expressed, including paragraphs for new ideas; referenced other sections, data tables, or graphs where appropriate; contained sentence structure that enhanced the explanation; was obviously proof-read; and retained few, if any, typographical errors.
7: Report was organized into proper sections; referenced other sections, data tables, or graphs; was probably proof-read; and retained a few typographical errors.
6-5: Report was generally organized into proper sections; had some relation to other sections, data tables, or graphs; and retained several typographical errors.
4-3: Report had sections; was probably not proof-read; and had many typographical errors.
2-1: Report was not sectioned and mixed information that should be separated; was obviously not proof-read; and had many typographical errors that interfered with the clarity of the paper.
0: Report written in an obscure version of Medieval English and even then has misspellings. There is a drool stain blurring half of at least one collection of words that seems to be posing as a sentence.