

## Rubric for Student Reports: 12.307 – Weather and Climate Laboratory

	1. Deficient	2. Fair	3. Good	4. Excellent
Completeness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- misinterpreted project</li> <li>-- portions of project incomplete</li> <li>-- no evidence for conclusions</li> <li>-- misuse of ideas</li> <li>-- no attempt to integrate laboratory and synoptic observations</li> <li>-- late without permission</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- project not fully understood</li> <li>- jargon obscures arguments</li> <li>- observations or data insufficient</li> <li>- incomplete analysis</li> <li>- no discussion of relevant theory</li> <li>- disjointed discussion of lab and synoptic data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ all aspects of project carried out</li> <li>+ clear discussion of data in terms of theory</li> <li>+ attempt to integrate laboratory and synoptic data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>++ aims of project and report clearly stated</li> <li>++ excellent balance between theory and observation</li> <li>++ laboratory and synoptic experience seamlessly drawn together</li> </ul>
Data/Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- no data or fudged data</li> <li>-- excuses for not collecting data</li> <li>-- ignores feedback</li> <li>-- no use of theory to interpret observations or data</li> <li>-- no idea what to do with data</li> <li>-- no visuals, pictures or diagrams</li> <li>-- no discussion of errors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- random or sporadic data collection</li> <li>- little pattern to data collection</li> <li>- inaccurate or sloppy representations of observations and/or data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ careful records of a variety of measurements</li> <li>+ enough data to test theory</li> <li>+ full utilization of data</li> <li>+ appropriate graphical representations employed</li> <li>+ appropriate discussion of errors</li> <li>+ many questions arise from data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>++ original data carefully documented and graphed</li> <li>++ data professionally collected</li> <li>++ novel techniques employed and matched to problem</li> <li>++ error analysis</li> <li>++ designed further data collection to answer questions and test ideas</li> </ul>
Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- no sections, headings, subheadings..</li> <li>-- rambling, disparate sections</li> <li>-- supporting elements not tied into text</li> <li>-- lack of coherent arguments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- many organizational elements present (abstract, introduction and conclusion), but weak logical flow</li> <li>- sections not well integrated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ clear main point</li> <li>+ articulation of goals</li> <li>+ all relevant sections present</li> <li>+ sections well balanced</li> <li>+ outline clearly evident</li> <li>+ headings and subheadings used</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>++ logical thought progression</li> <li>++ all elements relevant and well incorporated</li> <li>++ structure clear and useful</li> <li>++ logical structure appropriate to the report</li> <li>+ appendices included if relevant</li> </ul>
Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- contains many errors (poor grammar, misspellings, difficult font, inconsistent style, lack of page numbers, incomplete sentences)</li> <li>-- lack of proofreading evident.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• few technical errors</li> <li>• consistent layout</li> <li>• form does not interfere with readability</li> <li>- appears rushed or unrefined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ well edited</li> <li>+ appropriate use of technical terms</li> <li>+ use of graphics (tables, graphs, drawing) where appropriate</li> <li>+ correct length</li> <li>+ varied sentence structure</li> <li>+ well proofread</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>++ model of clarity and good writing</li> <li>++ a joy to read, novelty, personal touches</li> <li>++ graphics well integrated</li> <li>++ constructed with the reader in mind</li> <li>++ well worth sharing with others</li> <li>++ edited to proper length</li> </ul>
Use of Sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- no references to sources</li> <li>-- no evidence of readings</li> <li>-- no evidence of note taking in class</li> <li>-- personal opinion treated as universal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- inappropriate or gratuitous incorporation of references</li> <li>- incorrect or insufficient citations</li> <li>- readings misinterpreted or ignored</li> <li>- lack of the most appropriate citations from required readings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ frequent, reliable citation to support several points</li> <li>+ incorporation of relevant required readings and class discussion</li> <li>+ readings shown to be clearly understood</li> <li>+ evidence of listening to other's ideas in class</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>++ variety of appropriate sources, articles, books, WWW sites</li> <li>++ quotations from classmates, professors</li> <li>++ integration of additional readings</li> <li>++ using ideas from other classes</li> <li>++ bringing to bear new insights and information</li> </ul>