Learning Goal 1: Attain scholarship, skills, and ability in the field

| FACET | OUTSTANDING (A) | GOOD (B+) | SATISFACTORY (B) | UNSATISFACTORY (C/F) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scholarship: Does the author make clear where the problems, methods and ideas sit with respect to existing literature? | Thorough understanding of relevant prior results and a deep appreciation for the way those results fit into the research area as a whole | Thorough understanding of the most important relevant prior results and a thoughtful awareness of how those results fit in | Essential understanding of key relevant prior results and a textbook understanding of their place in the field | Incomplete or flawed understanding of related work and its context |
| Skills: Are the technical steps sound and well-executed? | Use of techniques is correct, clear and well-executed | Use of techniques is solid, but work is worth revising for robustness, generality or clarity | Use of techniques is serviceable, despite minor limitations | Use of techniques is flawed, with critical errors, failings or deficiencies |
| Ability: Is the overall approach chosen and structured well? | Methods are selected and combined judiciously and adeptly | Reasonable strategy for solving the problem, with some potential for improvement | Gets the job done, despite some awkwardness | Overall approach is incoherent or inadequate |

Learning Goal 2: Engage in and conduct original research

| FACET | OUTSTANDING (A) | GOOD (B+) | SATISFACTORY (B) | UNSATISFACTORY (C/F) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Originality: Does this work break new ground in topic, methodology, or content? | Surprising: the work contributes new insights that go beyond prior work | Creative: the work is a cool new combination of known ideas | Novel but predictable: existing ideas are adapted or synthesized, but in straightforward ways | Derivative: apart from minor, obvious or inessential features, this has basically been done before |
| Documentation: Is there sufficient detail for an expert to validate the work, by replicating experiments or filling in theoretical steps? | Admirably clear what was done and why | Understandable by most readers | Mostly understandable with some effort and charity | Important questions were hard to resolve even with effort |
| Evaluation: Are the claims supported in an appropriate way, and meaningfully compared with prior approaches? | Claims are demonstrated clearly and convincingly, with precise comparisons | Solid evidence in support of claims, although work is worth revising to strengthen some aspects | Reasonable work at least for main claims, although the argumentation or comparison may have limitations | Flawed: the work should have been argued or compared differently |
| Significance: how important are the ideas, results or potential applications? | Clear argument for widespread importance | Good argument that there is a contribution that could help others' research or develment | The work is a contribution that could be cited or used, though perhaps mainly for comparison | Poor case why anyone else would care about the work |