

Observing Proposal Review Criteria

Scientific/Technical Merit

- Is the science interesting? Is it clearly described?
- Has background information been provided? That is, what have other researchers done in this area? What is the broader context of scientific issue being addressed?
- Can the scientific question be answered with the observations being requested?
- If you are proposing to study an individual object (or a few individual objects), have you given *quantitative* information about it (coordinates, magnitudes and/or surface brightnesses, angular size, distance/redshift etc)?
- If you are proposing to study a sample of objects, what are the sample selection criteria? What are characteristic properties (magnitudes, sizes, redshifts/distance, etc)
- What kind of data quality is needed? How well do you need to measure your magnitudes, colors, velocities, etc?
- What interpretation / analysis will you do with the results of the observations to answer your scientific questions?
- Will the proposed observing strategy deliver the necessary data quality, given the properties of your target(s)?
- Are your objects observable from Kitt Peak during the time you are proposing to use the telescope?

Writing/Presentation

- Is there a succinct abstract?
- Is information (concepts, models, supporting data) appropriately cited?
- Are figures used appropriately, and explained properly in the figure captions and/or text? Are they comprehensible?
- Does the scientific presentation flow logically and smoothly?
- Is the proposal written using proper grammar and spelling?
- Does it follow the format given in the assignment? (Remember that the assigned format and page limits are slightly different from the format given in the example proposals.)
- Don't play games with font, spacing, or page margins. Please use single-spaced, 12 point font with 1" margins. (Moderate use of bold or italics is okay, as is larger font for section headers.)