

CSC2537/STA2555: Research Report Rubrics

Grading item		Weak	Proficient	Mastery
1	Introduction	There is no introduction for a reader not well-versed in this area.	The introduction does a good job of introducing the area and sets up the stage for the question.	Covers relevant aspects of the area, succinct and easy for reader to follow. The research question follows naturally.
2	Research Question	Research question is absent, trivial (e.g. answer obviously "yes"), or not a question.	There's a promising question, but is not clearly stated.	Clearly stated. Has implications beyond just a simple yes/no answer
3	Hypothesis	Hypothesis same as research question/not present/trivial	Present, but has a simple yes/no answer. Or it's not clearly stated. Or it is too ambitious. Or it isn't clearly motivated (what makes you hypothesize so?)	Hypothesis is clearly stated, is not yes/no answerable, and can be answered in a term project.
4	Related work	Not present or just a list of papers	Related work is a description of what the papers say (so you read the papers), but you don't say why it is related. May be missing obvious related work.	5-7 Highly related academic papers are cited and discussed w.r.t. your work. There's justification that your paper fits in with related work. Note: saying "they did it, but we'll just do it better" with no justification won't fetch points :-)
5	Theoretical contribution	Not stated	It's hiding in the text somewhere, but isn't clear. Or contribution seems small.	It's a clear, useful, and important contribution.

Grading item		Weak	Proficient	Mastery
6	Method	It is unlikely the method can answer your hypothesis/Unstated	Method could work, but is vague (e.g. measures unclear). Or there are obvious better methods.	Method is clearly written. Meaning it is valid, not overly complicated and well thought through. It's a good match for the research question, and can meaningfully address the hypothesis.
7	Study	Weak study - not designed to elicit relevant response, haphazardly put together. Not caring for participants' ease.	Good handle on number of participants needed and nature of study. Consideration for participants' ease.	Valid study, not complicated, well thought through. Succeeds in eliciting response for the metrics defined.
8	Measures	Metrics not defined at all for the hypothesis being tested, or ambiguity left in definition.	Correct set of metrics, defined well, but doesn't explain the hypothesis completely - leaves scope for questions.	Perfect metrics - stays close to deciding the truth value of hypothesis.
9	Risks/Limitations	You don't state them explicitly, and they can't be inferred clearly	You acknowledge risks to your work, but don't say how to mitigate them.	You have explicitly mentioned the risks, and have tried to structure your work to minimize them.
10	Execution	Project progress was much different from the plan, poor execution.	The project was executed mostly in line with the plan (method, study, risks) and some proof has been presented.	Great execution! Presented numerous evidence of performing the study/implementation and collecting data as laid out.
11	Results	Results not stated.	Results hiding in the text somewhere, expects readers to dig it up.	Result mentioned crisply, in line with the hypothesis. Appropriate statistical tests (e.g. CHI squared, t-test, ANOVA) are reported.
12	Data presentation	Results just dumped in text. No effort to make it easier for the reader to understand.	Efforts at drawing relevant graphs, charts to bring out the patterns in results. Amateur presentation (missing labels on axes or labels etc.)	Great use of data visualization techniques (charts, graphs) to bring out the point clearly without parsing through long text.

Grading item		Weak	Proficient	Mastery
13	Analysis & Discussion	No analysis of results.	Some analysis of results, but mostly superficial. Just restating numbers.	Detailed analysis of results. Shows good understanding of the entire process by working back from results to hypothesis, teases apart data to ask more questions.
14	Future Work	Not thought through or not mentioned at all.	Mentioned briefly but not in detail or not in any priority. A bucket list of n possible next steps.	Well thought out set of next steps in order which will continue from this work. Ties in well with the larger research question.
15	Coherence & Length	Not coherent. Individual parts maybe good, but together, it doesn't make sense. (e.g. you have a great, well thought through method, but it just doesn't relate to the research question)	Some sections are coherent, others are not.	Everything fits - your paper is coherent and the individual parts conceptually well-synthesized. Paper is 3 - 5 pages.