PHY241: Observing Project Rubric

Aspect	I (70-100%)	II.1 (60-69%)	II.2 (50-59%)	III (45-49%)	PASS (40-44%)	Fail (<40%)
Planning (15%)	Describes reason for choosing target and justifies that target is visible and suitable for experiment with **given equipment**.	Summarises target choice. Clear discussion of observability, but limited reference to limitations of equipment.	Some attempt to describe planning. Perhaps some errors, or little matching of target to equipment limitations.	A poor attempt to describe planning, with several errors.	A very poor attempt to explain planning, with many errors.	No attempt to describe the planning stage.
Observations (15%)	A clear description of the observations and calibrations. Allows the reader to know if data are **reliable**, and **how** it was taken.	A good description of observations/calibrations taken. Some needless details or key details missing.	A reasonable description of observations taken. Level sometimes misjudged. Occasional errors.	A poorly focussed explanation of the observations, with some errors.	A very poor description of the observations. Missing details and with several errors.	No attempt to describe the observations taken.
Analysis (30%)	Excellent data analysis. It is clear **from write up** that each step is correctly and carefully done. Description allows replication, without irrelevant detail.	Good data analysis. All relevant steps correctly carried out and checked carefully. Well explained at generally correct level of detail.	OK data analysis. All steps performed, but some without due care and small errors. Explanation of analysis may be too detailed, or does not allow **replication** or assessment of **reliability**.	A poor data analysis with some steps missing or incorrectly carried out. Explanation is often missing or level misjudged.	A very poor data analysis with several steps either missing or incorrect. Unclear explanation of analysis.	Extremely poor analysis with explanation either missing or largely incorrect.
Results (25%)	Implications of data fully explored. Results contain careful discussion of uncertainties and comparison to previous literature.	Implications of data explored. Comparison has minor issues or uncertainties mis-handled. Comparison to literature present, but shallow.	Implications of data partially explored. A few errors in treatment or error analysis. Poor comparison to previous work.	Very poor results section. Implications of data barely discussed. Minimal comparison to models. Error analysis has many issues or largely absent	Data is incorrectly compared to models or not compared at all. Little or no attempt to treat errors.	Data is not examined further, with no error treatment or comparison to models and/or previous work.
Presentation (15%)	Well **organised** and laid out. Good english. Use of **primary** references almost exclusively. **Clear** presentation of data.	Reads OK. Satisfactory english and **clear structure**. Incomplete referencing, or use of some **web sources**. Average presentation of data (e.g poor labels, unclear figures)	Does not read very well. English has some errors. **Little structure**. Referencing incomplete or relies **entirely on web** sources. Graphs unclear, **missing axes**.	Reads poorly. Significant errors hamper clarity. **No structure**. References **largely absent**. **Graphs poor**.	Reads very poorly. Often difficult to understand. No structure. No references. Graphs bad.	Very bad. Hard to understand throughout. No references, structure or graphs.