Case Study Rubric
DS 4002 Prototyping
Instructor: Professor Alonzi

The following is the rubric against which your final model, code, and report containing higher level analysis, a summary of challenges, solutions, and next steps will be compared to calculate your final grade. See your instructor with any questions and good luck.

Evaluation Criteria	Exceeds Expectations (A)	Meets Spec Expectations (B)	Needs Improvement (C)	Fails to Meet Spec (F)
Model Quality/ Reproducibility	Model is easily replicable, produces meaningful outputs and/or clearly documents the process/ reasoning behind decision making, utilizes creative/ innovative techniques	Model is reproducible, creates interesting outputs with minor discrepancies or shortcomings from original results, mostly complete documentation/ reasoning	Model is difficult to reproduce, contains significant errors, fails to include some key elements or proper documentation	Model is impossible to reproduce, fails to produce outputs, missing several key components, includes little/no documentation
Code Caliber/ Organization	Code is clean, thoroughly annotated, follows best practices, well structured and easily navigable	Code is mostly clean, mostly-annotated, mostly organized and followable	Code is functional but messy, fails to include useful annotation elements, lacks overall clarity	Code is not functional, un-annotated, or otherwise impossible to use meaninfully
Data Handling/ EDA Quality	Exceptional understanding of the data source, includes well annotated, quality preprocessing, and makes meaningful initial findings	Sufficient understanding of the data source, overlooks some helpful details, adequately annotated, provides a solid starting point for further analysis	Limited understanding of the data source, overlooks several necessary steps in preprocessing, produces only marginally useful findings	Lacks basic understanding of the data source, fails to conduct helpful preprocessing or visualizations/ findings of any substance.

Report Analysis/ Insights	Conducts and conveys through analysis that provides further insights into the original research question, clearly confirms or rejects hypothesis, well-written and simple to follow	Conducts mostly quality analysis and provides some interesting further insights into the research question, addresses the original hypothesis, is mostly well-written and followable	Conducts some analysis of significance, provides marginally relevant insights into the research question, inadequately addresses the hypothesis, contains several errors, complex and convoluted	Fails to make any meaningful analysis of results, fails to provide any insights into the research question or address the hypothesis, filled with errors, extremely difficult to follow
Reflection and Next Steps	Thoughtfully reflects on all challenges encountered during the process, proposes actionable future improvements yields interesting/ relevant next steps to pursue	Reflects on some challenges faced with sufficient depth, contains some actionable improvement suggestions, contains relevant next step suggestions	Reflection is superficial, fails to mention key challenges, contains non-actionable items for improvement, next steps are irrelevant or out of proper scope	Missing reflection component entirely, fails to mention challenges, does not suggest areas of improvement, fails to include any next-step suggestions
Repository Organization/ Accessibility	Repo is well organized with proper folder and file names, and provides a well composed ReadMe file helpful in direct users	Repo is mostly organized, contains intuitive names, contains a ReadMe file with further instructions	Repo is unorganized, contains some mislabeled/ un-named files, fails to utilize organizational folders, ReadMe lacks clarity	Repo is inaccessible, contains mislabeled/ un-named files, unorganized or impossible to navigate effectively, fails to include a ReadMe file.