

Student:		
Title:		
		Points
<u>Introduction (25pts)</u>	(Clearly define big picture and hypothesis)	25
	Introduction establishes the broad relevance of the problem. Why should someone care? (i.e., the TED Talk moment describing the "big picture")	
	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 and goals are clearly defined.	
	Agents are clearly described	
	Environment the agent will be tested in is clearly defined	
	The performance metrics make sense within the goals of the study.	
<u>Code (25pts)</u>	(State the form of your model)	25
	Entire notebook is independently executable in Google Colaboratory	
	Code is organized and structure is clear	
	Adequate use of comments to explain the code.	
	Results are plotted in visual form (e.g., as opposed to streams of raw numbers)	
	Printed output is limited to only relevant details.	
<u>Results (20pts)</u>	(What was found? How can we see it?)	20
	Graphical integrity. Are plots clear and communicating results accurately & effectively?	
	Is the model evaluated in a way to meet the hypothesis defined in the beginning?	
	Are the tests of the model rigorous (with regards to the main hypothesis posed)?	
	Are the results clearly summarized verbally?	
<u>Conclusions (20 pts)</u>		20
	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?	
<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