|  |
| --- |
| **Element Score** |
| **Element** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| **Title page** | Contains names of experimenters, date, descriptive title, ME 190, and is *attractively laid out* | Contains names of experimenters, date, descriptive title, ME 190, and *may not be as attractive as it could be* | Contains names of experimenters, but *may be missing* date, or title, or ME 190 | *Missing two of the required elements* | *No title or missing multiple items* |
| **Background** | Background on the IMU is *well-described*, such that someone who previously did not know about it would be well-informed about the unit. References cited, etc. | Background on the IMU is *adequately described*, such that someone who previously did not know about it would be adequately, but maybe not well- informed. | Background on the IMU is adequately described, but *may be missing some detail* that would be helpful | Background on the IMU is *less than adequately described* | Background is *skimpy or not adequate* |
| **Exp. Setup** | Experimental setup is *clear and well described*, so that a peer could easily reproduce the setup | Experimental setup is *fairly well* described, so that it is probably likely that a peer could reproduce it | Experimental setup is *somewhat* described, but a peer might need additional information to reproduce the setup | Experimental setup is *missing important information*, and it would be difficult to reproduce the setup. | Experimental setup is *not well described*, and a peer probably could not reproduce it from the description. |
| **Tests conducted** | The tests conducted were *clearly described and results clearly graphed and/or tabulated*. | The tests conducted and results are *adequately described*.  | The tests conducted and results are described, but *could be improved* in completeness and/or clarity. | The tests conducted and results are *described somewhat, but are missing information or not clear*. | Description of tests and results are *significantly lacking in completeness and/or clarity* |
| **Code** | Code is *fully commented and clearly presented*. | Code is *commented to a large degree and is readable*. | Code has *some comments and is somewhat readable*. | Code is *missing some comments and is somewhat lacking in readability*. | Code is *significantly lacking in comments and/or clarity*. |
| **Discussion** | Discussion of results is *complete, clear, and is compelling* for the results obtained. | Discussion is *adequate* for the results obtained. | Discussion *for the most part addresses the result*, but could be improved. | Discussion is *somewhat lacking* in addressing what happened with the results. | Discussion is *significantly lacking* in addressing what happened with the results. |
| **Conclusions** | Conclusions are *thoughtfully prepared, clear, and complete* | Conclusions are *adequately described* | Conclusions f*or the most part are appropriate, but could be improved or expanded* | Conclusions are *not fully described or somewhat lacking* | Conclusions are *significantly lacking* |
| **Summary of contributions** | Contributions by each team member are *clearly articulated*. | Contributions by team members are *adequately described*. | Contributions by team members are mentioned, but *may lack in clarity and completeness*. | Contributions by team members are *not entirely clear.* | Contributions are *inadequately described*. |
| **Appendices**(may or may not be needed) | Appendices are *fully appropriate and add value to the report*. | Appendices are *appropriate*. | Appendices, if appropriate, *may be lacking to some degree* in completeness and/or clarity | Appendices, if appropriate, *are lacking to a large degree* in completeness and/or clarity | Appendices are *missing*, when they should be present *or not acceptably* presented. |