# 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. |