

Physics Lab Feedback Sheet

Week: _____ Experiment: _____ Student: _____

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| Format / Presentation / Timeline | 0 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 15 |
| | Badly formatted. Illegible. Missing timeline. | Minimal timeline with many gaps. Legible but with several issues, e.g. poor handwriting, poor structure, in pencil, missing axis labels/units etc. | Legible, in pen. Sensible layout in sections. Timeline mostly present. Some issues, e.g. incorrect axis labels or wrong units. | Very good overall structure and presentation, with only a few minor issues. Good, complete timeline. | Excellent structure/format. Hardly any presentation problems. Detailed, complete timeline. |
| Description of Method | 0 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 15 |
| | Missing or very poor. | Poor description of method and/or apparatus. Mostly lacking in detail. Unclear what steps were performed. | Sensible description of method and apparatus, but may have too much/too little detail. States specific actions that were performed. | Good, insightful explanation of method and apparatus. Explains specific actions, as well as steps taken to get better results. | Excellent understanding and control over method and apparatus. Full, detailed account of what was done and improvements that were made. |
| Observations | 0 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 15 |
| | Missing. | Minimal observations. Little information on experimental conditions. | Some useful observations but unclear or lacking in detail. Basic description of experimental conditions. | Useful observations of physical phenomena, apparatus behaviour, and conditions during experiment. | Detailed, insightful observations covering all relevant aspects of the experiment. Clear understanding of relevance of the observations. |
| Physical Understanding | 0 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 15 |
| | Missing, or very poor. | Unclear and/or minimal discussion of relevant physics, or significant errors in understanding. | Basic level of correct physics, but not well connected to experiment; or more in-depth/relevant physics, but with mistakes. | Demonstrates good understanding of relevant physics, few mistakes. Physical implications of the experiment well-explained. | Excellent level of understanding, very few mistakes. Clear discussion of relevance/implications. Goes significantly beyond the lab script. |
| Interpretation and Discussion of Results | 0 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 15 |
| | Missing, or very poor. | Only basic calculations performed (or more complex calculations with serious errors). Limited or flawed discussion of results. | Appropriate calculations with minor mistakes or omissions. Basic but sensible discussion of results and their implications. | Full set of calculations with only minor issues. Detailed discussion with well-justified interpretation. Discusses possible improvements. | Full and rigorous calculations, with no problems. Complete and well-reasoned discussion with insights beyond what is written in the script. |
| Error/ Uncertainty Analysis | 0 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 15 |
| | Missing errors and uncertainty analysis. | Only a basic discussion of sources of error/uncertainty. Unjustified or often missing error estimates. | Broad but reasonably basic discussion of sources of error. Basic attempt at error propagation. | Thoughtful discussion of sources of error. Competent estimation and propagation of errors. | Thorough and insightful discussion of the source of errors. Full treatment for propagation of errors. |
| Conclusions | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 10 |
| | Missing. | Very short. No summary. No discussion of findings. | Short. Summary of method/findings is present, but lacks detail. | Good summary of experiment, results, and physical implications. | Excellent summary of experiment, results, and physical implications. |

Marker:

Total mark: