

ASTR 8060 FINAL PROJECT RUBRIC

Experimental Design/Technical Description ($\times 5$)

- (10) Well-defined, clear and feasible methodology that will accomplish all the science goals proposed.
- (9) A well-defined, feasible approach and good methodology that will accomplish most of the proposed goals.
- (8) Approach has a good chance of accomplishing the proposed science goals.
- (7) This proposal does not stand out from the group as being particularly strong or weak at accomplishing the science goals proposed.
- (6) It is unclear that the methodology, as described, will accomplish the science goals proposed.
- (5) The methodology is not well thought out or is unlikely to accomplish the goals.
- (3) This proposal is seriously flawed. Do not schedule: The targets are not available, or the observations are technically impossible.
- (0) Incomplete or missing.

Scientific Justification ($\times 3$)

- (10) Especially compelling observing program with extremely well defined scientific goals that address a clear astrophysical problem.
- (9) Compelling well-defined goals and addresses an astrophysical problem.
- (8) Has good science content and addresses a problem or object(s) of interest.
- (7) This proposal has merit, but does not stand out from the group as being particularly strong or weak
- (6) The science is of some value but the proposal is not compelling, or the proposal/science goals may be weak or poorly described.
- (5) The scientific goals are unclear. Even if the observations are made, it is not clear how or if the science will be advanced.
- (3) This proposal is seriously flawed. Do not schedule: The science is wrong.
- (0) Incomplete or missing.

Proposal Review Panel ($\times 2$)

Your grade for the panel review will consist of an equal combination of your grade assigned by the panel according to the above categories and your participation in panel activities as described below.

- **(10)** Prepared written feedback for primary review and gave a clear and accurate introduction to the proposal, made meaningful and insightful points during panel discussion.
- **(9)** Prepared notes for primary review and introduced proposal accurately, participated during panel discussion and made meaningful points.
- **(8)** Introduced proposal accurately and participated in panel discussion, one of these efforts stood out positively.
- **(7)** Gave an introduction for primary review, participated panel discussion.
- **(6)** Introduced proposal for primary review and participated in discussion, but summary was sometimes unclear or discussion was limited.
- **(5)** Could not introduce primary review or summary was unclear, very limited participation in panel discussion.
- **(3)** Not prepared to introduce proposal, did not participate in panel discussion.
- **(0)** Did not attend.