

PHY217: 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 %)	Clearly describes reasons for target and project choice with respect to observability and limitations of equipment.	Summarises target choice and choice of project. Some discussion of limitations.	Some attempt to describe planning. Perhaps the level is misjudged, or some errors.	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 and thorough description of the observations taken at the correct level of detail.	A largely complete description of observations taken. Generally at correct level of detail.	A reasonable description of observations taken. Level sometimes misjudged.	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. Care has been taken with each step, and analysis is clearly explained at correct detail.	Good data analysis. All relevant steps correctly carried out with reasonable attention. Well explained at generally correct level of detail.	OK data analysis. All steps performed, but some without due care. Explanation of analysis is present but level is sometimes misjudged.	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 work.	Implications of data explored. Treatment occasionally sloppy or error mis-handled. Comparison to previous work 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 expectations. 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. Correct and complete referencing. Good presentation of data.	Reads OK. Satisfactory english. Incomplete referencing in good style. Average presentation of data.	Does not read very well. English has some errors. Little structure. Referencing incomplete. Graphs poor.	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.