

Student (s):		
Title:		
		Points
<u>Background & Problem (20pts)</u>	(Clearly define big picture and hypothesis)	20
	Introduction establishes the broad relevance of the problem. Why should someone care?	
	Language that is specific to the presenter's subfield is defined appropriately for a general audience of scientists.	
	The logic and key details of the experimental design are clear. If the data were otherwise acquired (e. g., opportunistic sampling, big data), then the relevant details of original data acquisition are clearly presented.	
	The motivation for the hypothesis is clear.	
	The hypothesis is clearly defined.	
<u>Model & Environment (20pts)</u>	(State the form of your model)	20
	What is the form of your model(s)?	
	Is the environment/task clearly defined?	
	Are all equations clearly defined?	
<u>Results (25pts)</u>	(What was found? How can we see it?)	25
	Is the model evaluated in a way to meet the hypothesis defined in the beginning?	
	Are all relevant plots/tables provided to interpret the findings?	
	Are the results clearly summarized verbally?	
<u>Conclusions & Interpretations (15 pts)</u>		15
	Show that the interpretation demonstrates a basic understanding of the techniques used.	
	Show that the interpretation of the results respects the limitations of the model.	
	Is the interpretation thorough (e.g., must explain directionality and size of the effects, if appropriate, instead of simply stating significance)?	
	Do the conclusions link to the introductory context and hypothesis?	
	Do follow-up questions/analyses logically follow from the current results?	
<u>Teamwork (10)</u>		10
	Demonstrate substantial effort (according to your teammates) to the design of the project.	
	Demonstrate substantial effort (according to your teammates) to the implementation of the project.	
	Demonstrate substantial effort (according to your teammates) to the presentation of the project.	
	Demonstrate substantial reliability of effort (according to your teammates) over the course of the project.	
<u>General Comments (10)</u>		10
	The notebook itself draws on relevant formatting features for clear presentation (markdown, sectioning).	
	The functional form of the models used to evaluate the hypothesis is explicitly written.	
	Variable names have clear meanings. The analysis is generally clearly implemented and code is intuitive to follow.	
	The language used to scaffold the presentation is concise but descriptive enough to convey the main points of the presentation.	
	Each step well-justified and remains faithful to the variability present in the data (i.e., no removal of data without a well-reasoned justification).	
<u>Grade</u>		100