Rubric to Evaluate Peer Project Drafts

Performance Element	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Emerging (1)	Not Present (0)
Communication	Provides numerous supporting details, graphs, tables, etc. and examples are organized logically and coherently. An exemplary scholarly work.	Provides some supporting details, graphs, tables, etc. and examples in an organized manner. Information and visualizations are presented in a thoughtful and useful way.	Provides few details or examples in somewhat organized manner. Style and presentation should be improved. Somewhat difficult to navigate.	Provides few or no details or states the main idea or problem verbatim from the description. Written in a narrative form (akin to a diary entry) as opposed to scholarly work.	Difficult to read, appreciate and navigate through the results. Fails to identify strengths or weaknesses. Fails to present evidence.
Analysis	Uses specific inductive or deductive reasoning to make inferences regarding premises; addresses implications and consequences; identifies facts and relevant info correctly. The key findings are clearly and concisely communicated and supported.	Uses logical reasoning to make inferences regarding recommendations; addresses implications and consequences; Identifies facts and relevant info correctly. Key findings are easily identified.	Uses superficial reasoning to make inferences regarding recommendations; Shows some confusion regarding facts, opinions, and relevant, evidence, data or info. While findings are identified, they are difficult to understand or not well supported.	Makes unexplained, unsupported or unreasonable inferences regarding recommendations; makes multiple errors in distinguishing fact from fiction or in selecting relevant evidence. Authors unsuccessfully attempt to present their findings.	Does not analyze multiple solutions No findings identified. The reader is left to wander through the output alone….
Evaluation	Insightfully interprets data/info; identifies obvious as well as hidden assumptions, avoids fallacies in reasoning; distinguishes appropriate arguments from extraneous elements; provides sufficient logical support.	Accurately interprets data/info; identifies obvious assumptions, avoids fallacies in reasoning; distinguishes appropriate reasoning; distinguishes appropriate arguments from extraneous elements; provides sufficient logical support.	Makes some errors in data/info interpretation; makes arguments using weak evidence; provides superficial support for conclusions or recommendations.	Interprets data/info incorrectly. Supports conclusions or recommendations without evidence or logic; uses data, info or evidence skewed by invalid assumptions; uses fallacious arguments.	Does not evaluate data, info or evidence related to recommendation.
Technical Ability	Mastery of coding language and technical skills is obvious. Appropriate techniques are employed with reasonable parameter settings. Algorithm choices and settings are well justified.	Authors are obviously technically competent. For the most part, appropriate techniques are employed with reasonable parameter settings throughout. Some choices should be better justified.	Coding skills and technical competence is evident; however some algorithmic choices should be revised and improved. Choices should be justified.	Some coding skills and technical competence are demonstrated, however, a many of algorithmic choices are highly questionable and/or poorly justified.	Error ridden code and/or totally inappropriate techniques implemented throughout.