**Marking Rubrics for Milestone 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Exceptional: 4.5-5** | **Good: 3.5-4** | **Acceptable: 3** | **Needs work/ Unacceptable: 0-2.5** |
| Content and organization. | Overall the content is complete, relevant, accurate & well organized It is clearly written. | Content is generally complete, relevant, accurate & well organized. The writing style is acceptable. | Content is appropriate but may be disorganized. It is hard to follow the flow of the milestone and the sections. | Content is weak & disorganized.  The writing is confusing with lots of errors. |
| Purpose and Background literature review | The purpose is clear and well-motivated.  The background literature is complete, well organized, and contributes to the purpose/motivation. It demonstrates a strong understanding of the topic and challenges of exploring this topic area. It is clearly written and organized. Proper format for citations. | The purpose is clear and partly motivated.  The background literature is mostly complete and helps to motivate the goal of the work. It shows a good understanding of the topic and challenges but the reader may be left with some questions. The writing style is acceptable. And citation format is mostly correct (they may not be properly placed). | The purpose is mostly clear but not clearly motivated. Reader has some questions.  The background shows some understanding of the topic but only partly contributes to the purpose. It is missing some important aspects of the topic or only focused on one area. It is hard to follow the writing. Formatting and/or placement of citations are incorrect. | The purpose is not clear or well-motivated.  The background shows limited understanding of the topic and does not demonstrate how it contributes to the purpose. It shows limited understanding of the topic and challenges. The writing is confusing with lots of errors.  Citations are missing and not formatted correctly. |
| Objectives | The objectives are understandable and concise. They are clearly defined and directly relate to the purpose and motivation of the study. They are also appropriate for our study population. | The objectives are generally reasonable, and concise but may not be directly tied to the purpose and motivation. They are appropriate for the study population. | The objectives are somewhat reasonable but needs some clarification. There is some disconnect with the study population. | The objectives are confusing and need to be reworked before running the study. |
| Study Design | The study design and process are complete and easy to understand. All sections are complete. These are clearly written. | The study design and study process are mostly completed and easy to understand. All the sections are addressed and mostly complete although a few clarifications are needed. The writing style is acceptable. | Parts of the study design and process are acceptable but there are parts that require further explanation before proceeding with the study. | The study design and process are confusing. And the sections are missing important elements that must be included before proceeding |
| Study Instruments (Interview/  Contextual inquiry) | The tool is well constructed with the questions and process all contributing to the objectives. It is well organized and relevant. It allows for an in-depth discussion about the topic with users. There is no or little discussion of 'your' solution to the problem or what they want. | The tool is mostly complete and will help with the objectives. It is mostly organized but some parts (e.g., questions) are unclear and may need some re-wording. There may be too much discussion of 'your' solution to the problem or what they want. | The tool needs some clarification. It is confusing and not well organized (e.g. by themes) at times. The tool may not help achieve the objectives (e.g., some questions may be leading). The questions focus more on your ideas for solutions and not enough on how users currently. | The tool needs major revision. It is = not organized, confusing and unclear. It's not clear how the tool will help achieve the objectives. The tool will need to be reworked before the study. |
| Other Instruments  (Script, task list, coding sheets) | The tools are all present and are well constructed and organized. | The tools are all present but may need some small changes. | The tools are all present but need a lot of changes. | Not all the tools are present and ones that are need major revisions (e.g., just used the templates without individualizing them). |
| Citations and References | Citations are complete and consistent (both in the reference section and when doing in paper citations). Papers are peer-reviewed, reputable papers. | Citations are mostly complete but may be missing some information (e.g., the date) and are mostly consistent (both in the reference section and when doing in paper citations). Papers are peer-reviewed, reputable papers. | Citations are missing important information (e.g., place of publication or distinction between conference proceeding and journal papers). Not enough of the papers are peer-reviewed, reputable papers. | Citations are incomplete, inconsistent and may be missing (be careful with missing citations!). Few or none of the papers are peer-reviewed. This section will need to be redone for the final project report. |
| Writing and Organization | The layout, citations, & writing style is outstanding (including spelling and grammar). It is well organized, consistent layout has been proofread, is easy to follow. All appendices (and figures if included) are properly labeled and referred to in text. It feels like a cohesive document (e.g., writing style is consistent). | Layout, citations, & writing style is very good. It is for the most part organized with mostly a consistent layout. The writing may have minor spelling and/or grammar mistakes. Most the appendices/ figures are properly labeled and referred to in text. The paper for the most part feels like a cohesive with minor changes in writing styles. | Layout & writing style is adequate. It needs to be better organized and needs more attention to the layout. The writing has spelling and/or grammar mistakes. Appendices (figures) need better labels and/or need to be referred to in text. The paper lacks cohesion is some parts. | Layout & writing style is unacceptable. It lacks organization and has an inconsistent layout throughout the paper. There are several spelling and/or grammar mistakes that affect the readability. Appendices (figures) have not been properly labeled or referred to in the text. The paper lacks overall cohesion. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Components** | **Points** | **Given Points** |
| Overall Content | 0-5 points |  |
| Purpose and Background | 0-5 points |  |
| Objectives | 0-5 points |  |
| Study Design | 0-5 points |  |
| Study Instruments (main interview/contextual inquiry, etc.) | 0-10 points |  |
| Citations | 0-5 points |  |
| Writing Style | 0-5 points |  |
| **MAX Points and Total:** | **40 Points** |  |