

General	Excellent	Good	Sufficient	Insufficient
Presentation: name, date, experiment name, all relevant sections present, page numbers, highlighted result	3 <i>All 6 criteria met</i>	2 <i>5 criteria met</i>	1 <i>3-4 criteria met</i>	0 <i>< 3 criteria met</i>
Units to all values	3 <i>100%</i>	2 <i>>75%</i>	1 <i>>50%</i>	0 <i><50%</i>
Significant digits	3 <i>100%</i>	2 <i>>75%</i>	1 <i>>50%</i>	0 <i><50%</i>
Results written in consistent and common format (e.g. value $\pm$ uncertainty)	3 <i>100%</i>	2 <i>>75%</i>	1 <i>>50%</i>	0 <i><50%</i>
Subtotal:	... / 12			
Measurements				
Clarity of measurement procedure (How was it measured? What was measured?)	3 <i>Clear without prior knowledge</i>	2 <i>Need prior knowledge / manual to understand</i>	1 <i>Not understandable / incomplete description</i>	0 <i>No description at all</i>
Completeness of measurements (are all measurements present?)	3 <i>100%</i>	2 <i>>75%</i>	1 <i>>50%</i>	0 <i><50%</i>
Uncertainties present for all measurements	3 <i>100%</i>	2 <i>>75%</i>	1 <i>>50%</i>	0 <i><50%</i>
Accuracy of the measured values (how close to the expected values)	3 <i>Very accurate</i>	2 <i>Mostly as expected</i>	1 <i>Some values are quite off</i>	0 <i>Values are not realistic</i>
Presence of required equations (clear for every result how it was obtained?)	3 <i>100%</i>	2 <i>>75%</i>	1 <i>>50%</i>	0 <i><50%</i>
Completeness of results and error calculation (are all results and error calculations present?)	3 <i>100%</i>	2 <i>>75%</i>	1 <i>>50%</i>	0 <i><50%</i>
Subtotal:	... / 18			
Graphs				
Presence of required graphs (are all measurements present?)	3 <i>100%</i>	2 <i>>75%</i>	1 <i>>50%</i>	0 <i><50%</i>
Axes label with units	3 <i>100%</i>	2 <i>>75%</i>	1 <i>>50%</i>	0 <i><50%</i>
Uncertainties in the graph (error bars)	3 <i>100%</i>	2 <i>>75%</i>	1 <i>>50%</i>	0 <i><50%</i>
Fit (accuracy as well as description of fit model)	3 <i>Fits well, fitted model is clear</i>	2 <i>Does not fit well / model unclear</i>	1 <i>Bad fit, model not accurate</i>	0 <i>No fit</i>
Presence of figure captions (how well is the figure described)	3 <i>The figure is well described</i>	2 <i>The figure is not described fully</i>	1 <i>Merely figure titles</i>	0 <i>No captions</i>
Subtotal:	... / 15			
Report				
Structure (e.g. report has the proper sections, continuity)	3 <i>Great</i>	2 <i>Good</i>	1 <i>Sufficient</i>	0 <i>Bad</i>
Language (English, typesetting, scientific language)	3 <i>Great</i>	2 <i>Good</i>	1 <i>Sufficient</i>	0 <i>Bad</i>
Consistency (switch active / passive voice, "I" vs. "we", tenses)	3 <i>Consistent</i>	2 <i>Minor inconsistencies</i>	1 <i>Rather chaotic</i>	0 <i>Fully mixed</i>
General impression (Layout, presentation, length)	3 <i>Perfect</i>	2 <i>Good</i>	1 <i>Sufficient</i>	0 <i>Bad</i>
Discussion of final results and comparison with expected results / literature values	6 <i>Exhausting and thorough</i>	4 <i>Simple comparison, vague discussion</i>	2 <i>Only descriptive, not a discussion</i>	0 <i>No discussion at all</i>
Subtotal:	... / 18			
Total:	... / 63			

Please note:

This table should serve as general guideline of how to grade reports. It is not complete and needs adaption to the specific experiment (e.g. if tables are required, no graphs are present, no fits are requested etc.)

The experimental performance should be judged separately, with criteria similar to:

- How well was the performance?
- How much help and input from the assistant was needed?
- Were the students careful with the equipment?
- Did the students know what the next step was?
- Was the procedure clear or more "try and error"?
- Was it clear why which quantity was measured?

Ideally, two separate grades are given for both, the experimental performance and report-writing, respectively.

Grading:

The Swiss grading system ranges from 6 to 1, with the following correspondence:

6 = excellent; 5 = good; 4 = sufficient; 3 = insufficient; 2 = bad; 1 = very bad

Thus, in order to get a sufficient grade, 60% of the maximal achievable points are required. The formula to convert percentages of points ($= (\text{\#points_achieved} / \text{max_points}) * 100$) to grades is therefore **(%_of_points / 20) + 1**.

Example: In the grid above, 60 points is the maximum. If somebody achieves 44 points (=70% of 60 points), then the grade is $70/20+1 = 4.5$

Version from Monday, 22 February 2021.

Compiled by A. Eggenberger, based on inputs by N. Le Biavan, includes inputs from M. Spörri and M. Kroner.