	Outstanding	Good	Acceptable	Needs work	Needs a lot of work
Introduction	10	8	6	4	2
	Clearly and concisely describes the data, and why it is of interest. Sets up clear roadmap for the rest of the paper	Good introduction to data, but roadmap for rest of paper lacking.	Introduction and roadmap unclear and missing important details.	Rote description of data. No context provided for data or questions.	Fails to introduce data and questions of interest.

Questions and findings

	Outstanding	Good	Acceptable	Needs work	Needs a lot of work
Curiosity	20	16	12	8	4
	Intense exploration and evidence of many trials and failures. Presents best ideas, rather than all ideas. Additional research from other sources used to help understand/explain findings.	Plenty of exploration and investigation. Some additional research helps explain findings.	Some exploration, but little evidence that you have selected the best of many ideas. Little to no additional research.	Very little exploration, and no additional research. Presented results are only work done.	Questions are simple, and there is no evidence of exploration. Ideas primarily from in class discussion.
Scepticism	20	16	12	8	4
	Critical of findings, and uses multiple approaches and techniques to verify unintuitive results.	Some critical analysis, and some use of multiple techniques to answer the same question.	Generally, little criticism of findings and few approaches used.	Some findings accepted without question.	Findings accepted uncritically. Leaps of logic without justification.
Organisation	20	16	12	8	4
	Findings very well organised. Clear headings demarcate separate sections. Excellent flow from one section to the next. Clear evidence of systematic analysis.	Findings well organised and separate sections clearly separated, but flow is lacking. Each section has clear purpose.	Generally well organised, but some sections muddled.	Sections unclear and no attempt to flow from one topic to the next.	Report lurches haphazardly from one topic to the next. No unifying thread.
Conclusion	10	8	6	4	2
	Conclusions follows logically from results and findings. Includes interesting further questions and ideas for future research.	Good summary, but doesn't pull pieces together into cohesive whole. Interesting ideas for futre research	Summary patchy, but with some attempt at synthesis and development of ideas for future work.	Repeats findings with no synthesis. No proposoals for future work	Fails to summarise findings or ask more questions.

	Outstanding	Good	Acceptable	Needs work	Needs a lot of work
Presentation					
Text	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
	English is polished, concise and clear. No grammar or spelling mistakes	Clear and concise, but not elegant. A few spelling and gramatical errors	Readable, but excessively verbose, or lacking in detail. A number of errors in text.	Marginally readable. Many errors.	Barely readable. Many spelling and grammar errors. No evidence of proof reading
Graphs	**7.5**	**6**	**4.5**	**3**	**1.5**
	Graphs carefully tuned for desired purpose. Evdience that many graphs were created before choosing one for presentation. Each graph illustrates one point.	Graphs well chosen, but a few have minor problems: inappropriate aspect ratios, poor labels, poor quality when printed	Most graphs appropriate. Many graphs have minor problems.	Graphs poorly chosen to support questions. Some redundant or fundamentally flawed	Graphs do not support questions and findings. Major presentation problems
Tables	**7.5**	**6**	**4.5**	**3**	**1.5**
	All tables carefully constructed to make it easy to perform important comparisons. Careful styling highlights important features	Tables generally well constructed, but some have minor flaws: too many d.p, tables too large.	Most tables appropriate. Many tables have minor problems.	Tables badly arranged to support comparisons of interest. Too many, or inconsistant, decimal places	Tables do no support questions and findings. Major display problems.
Reproducibility	**10**	**8**	**6**	**4**	**2**
	Sufficiently detailed to reproduce entire report. Code nicely formatted and organised to follow flow of report	Code reproduces relevant findings, but poorly organised and hard to follow	Most findings can be reproduced, but many errors are present in code	Little documentation of procedure. Very difficult to reproduce results.	Major omissions, and substantial parts of the report can not be recreated.

Comments