NASA's Deep Impact Mission: Decision Making

Critiquing Ideas

ASSESSMENT GUIDE

As students present a case for a data collection method, assess the quality of their work as thoroughly and as equitably as you possibly can. The following criteria can be used, along with additions that have been agreed upon in advance.

Collection Method Description			
1 Description of data collection method(s) not provided or addressed.	2 Description of data collection method(s) is provided, but not expressed in a manner that is clear and easily understandable.	3 Description of data collection method(s) is provided in clear and understandable manner, but lacks some thoroughness.	4 Description of data collection method(s) is clear, understandable, thorough, and reinforced throughout presentation.
Evidence and Argument			
1 Evidence is not provided.	2 Some evidence is provided, but not explained or shown to be supportive of data collection method chosen.	3 Evidence is explained, but not used as effectively as possible to support argument for collection method chosen.	4 Evidence is explained and used admirably throughout presentation to support data collection method chosen.
Main Points and Organization			
1 Main points are not provided.	2 Main points are provided, but not organized.	3 Main points are provided and organized, but sometimes lost in the presentation.	4 Main points are clear, concise, and supported throughout presentation.
Scientific Merit			
1 Method(s) does not provide data that answers fundamental mission questions.	2 Method(s) provides data that only partially answers fundamental mission questions.	3 Method(s) provides data that answers fundamental mission questions, but does not allow for comparison, ties existing data, or compliments, to future projects.	4 Method(s) will provide data that answers mission questions, can be tied to existing data, allows for comparisons, and complements future projects and research.

Technical Merit			
1 Method(s) does not use tested instrumentation, and shows no indication of cost-effectiveness or minimization of risk.	2 Method(s) uses partially tested instrumentation, and carries costs, risk of data loss, no stated or implied potential for added value of data.	3 Method(s) has heritage in that instrumentation is fairly well proven, but represents questionable cost, possible but not overwhelming potential for data loss, and unclear added potential value.	4 Method(s) uses tested and proven instrumentation, represents minimal cost and/or risk of data loss, and provides for efficient data archival and posting, and provides added data value.
Visual Aids			
1 Visual aids are not provided.	2 Visual aids are provided, but not illustrative of important concepts.	3 Visual aids are well-done, and illustrative of important concepts.	4 Visual aids are well-done, reinforce important concepts, and effectively reinforce the presentation.
Delivery			
1 Group does not appear prepared to speak.	2 Delivery is systematic, but with annoying mannerisms and no eye contact.	3 Delivery is clean and clear, with some eye contact and very few annoyances.	4 Delivery is exceptional and unique, with regular eye contact and no annoyances.
Public Support			
1 Method(s) portrays potential negative public impact, environmentally or otherwise, and no information is provided to allay this impression.	2 Public support is not directly sought, nor is the question of environmental impact raised or implied.	3 Desire for public support is implied but not cultivated with definitive information; simple statement is made regarding the lack of potential negative environmental impact.	4 Information is provided to promote public support, and relationship of method(s) and potential environmental impact are respectfully and positively described.
Credibility of Resources			
1 Resources were mostly non-scientific sources, like tabloid newspapers; or all sources were encyclopedias.	2 Some resources were questionable, non-scientific sources; the majority of sources were encyclopedias.	3 Most resources were reliable scientific sources; encyclopedias were used only as first sources for terminology.	4 All resources were reliable scientific sources.

Use this space to create additional scoring criteria.

1	2	3	4 .
1	2	3	4 .