

	Outstanding (A+)	Good (A)	Acceptable (B)	Needs work (C)	Inadequate (F)
	5	4	3	2	1
<i>Curiosity</i>	<p>Intense exploration and evidence of many trials and failures. You have looked at the data in many different ways before coming to your final answer.</p> <p>You have gone beyond what was asked: additional research from other sources used to help understand/explain findings.</p> <p>Your explanation and presentation is creative</p>	<p>Plenty of exploration and investigation. Some additional research helps explain findings, and some of your ideas are creatively presented and explained.</p>	<p>Some exploration, but little evidence that you have selected the best of many ideas. Little or no additional research.</p>	<p>You have done the bare minimum that was asked. There is no evidence to suggest that you tried multiple approaches (tables, graphics, or models) before coming to your final conclusion.</p>	<p>Questions are simple, and there is no evidence of exploration. You have not come up with your own questions of the data, but relied on those we discussed in class</p>
<i>Scepticism</i>	<p>You suggest multiple explanations for a given finding, and use multiple tools to explore surprising results. You present one or two as the most plausible, but have allowed for the possibility that you are wrong.</p> <p>You are self-critical: What did I do well? What did I do poorly? What have I missed? How could I do better next time? You identify flaws in methodology and provide suggestions as to how they could be remedied</p> <p>You don't blindly accept perceived wisdom, but challenge preconceived notions and come up with interesting new ways of testing them.</p>	<p>You are sceptical and self-critical, but not consistently. There is some critical analysis, and some use of multiple techniques to answer the same question.</p>	<p>You haven't blinded accepted findings, but you haven't come up with many ways to check your results either.</p> <p>There is little self-criticism and little evidence to suggest you have thought about how to do better in the future.</p>	<p>Some findings accepted without question. Self-criticism weak.</p>	<p>Findings accepted uncritically. Leaps of logic without justification.</p> <p>You have not thought about how to do better next time.</p>
<i>Organisation</i>	<p>Findings very well organised. Clear headings demarcate separate sections. Excellent flow from one section to the next. The paper is easy to scan.</p> <p>An abstract or summary at the start of the paper briefly summarises your approach and findings. Conclusions at the end present further questions and ways to investigate more.</p> <p>Tables and graphics carefully tuned and placed for desired purpose.</p>	<p>Findings well organised and sections clearly separated, but flow is lacking. Each section has clear purpose.</p> <p>Tables and graphics clear and well chosen</p>	<p>Generally well organised, but some sections muddled.</p> <p>Tables or graphics appropriate, but some are poorly presented - too many decimal places, poorly chosen aspect ratio etc.</p>	<p>Sections unclear and no attempt to flow from one topic to the next.</p> <p>Graphics and tables poorly chosen to support questions. Some have fundamental flaws</p>	<p>It is hard to read your paper. There are no headings, figures are far away from where they are referenced in the text. There is no summary or conclusion.</p>