### Assessment Form[[1]](#footnote-1): Maker Lab Open-Inquiry Project Fully Substantiated Proposal

*Student name(s): name(s) Assessor(s): name(s)*

*Word count: how long? Date: when*

**Needs work Satisfactory Excellent**

**40% 70% 100%**

**1 Structure and communication**

* clear & coherent structure, adhering to word limit (1200-1600 words)   
* figures clearly presented, adhering to scientific conventions (e.g. captions

& axis labels and mentioned in text)   

* concise and precise scientific writing style  

* + 1. **Relevant background, methods, and initial results**
* clearly describes science of studied phenomena/relationship   
* clearly defines measured variables and explains principles of measurement   
* clearly describes experimental equipment and design;

making good use of figures (drawings, pictures, and/or charts)   

* highlights pertinent part(s) of the Arduino Sketch (i.e. the Arduino code),

focusing only on how it enables/influences the actual measurement process   

* clearly describes methods for quantitative data analysis and the relevant

statistical/mathematical models   

* identifies and estimates main sources of measurement uncertainty   
* describes pilot tests, initial experiments, or calibrations, and the results and

conclusions which are relevant to the further measurement plans   

* experimental progress is both good and sufficient as a proof-of-concept   

**3 Further plans and feasibility**

* clearly describes the specific research question and how further

measurements will quantitatively answer it   

* clearly describes ethical & safety considerations (where appropriate)   
* describes plans for controlling/decreasing the most significant

measurement uncertainties and demonstrates feasibility of the planned

experiment via comparison with predicted effect size   

**4 Penalties (*subtracted from overall grade*) penalty:**

* negligently cites relevant/authoritative sources or some borrowed material?

(note that plagiarism will be handled differently)

* late submission?

Strong points of project and paper:



Possible improvements:



Remaining Remarks or Questions:



Grade: % (average of the 14 categories, or just 13 depending on whether “ethics & safety” was an assessed category, minus any penalties)

1. For the grading rubric that inspired categories in this assessment form, please see:

   C.F.J. Pols et al <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3778087> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)