



General Requirements and Rubrics for Problem Sets

Below are the general requirements and rubrics for the problem sets.

I. General Requirement

1. **Being resourceful.** Please make at least 5 in-text citations and add the bibliography at the end of your writing.

- a. Please use the Chicago Manual of Style 17th edition (author-date) for your writing style, citations and bibliography. You can use [MyBib](#) to assist your formatting.

For instructions about how to use MyBib, please watch this [video](#).

- b. Please note that you should make citations for all the sources that you extract from other people/websites/paper/books/data. Loss of citations or references may lead to severe issues related to academic integrity.
 - c. Data-driven transformation is recommended and required for a high score in the Use of Sources/Documentation part of the rubric. If you use any data for illustration in your writing, please make sure of your choice of reliable data sources, and include the citation and bibliography for where you find the data. Reliable data source needed, data-driven transformation
2. **Logical writing and lucid communication:** Please make sure the logical flow of your writing is coherent and make all communications lucid. Please go through the following steps for revision.
 - a. Define all jargons for a general audience


- i. please provide citations and sources for the definition
 - ii. please explain all notations (Greek letters, math formula etc.) when first mention
- b. **Any argument should be sound and supported by evidence**
 - i. Evidence includes sources with citation and self-contained deductive (inductive) logic.
 - ii. The readers shall be clear about the source of all your content:
 - 1. Please refrain from using passive references as much as you can. Instead, introduce the supporting evidence in an active reference and further elaborate how the evidence supports your arguments.
 - 2. When you refer to the content of the paper that you are reviewing, please point out the (sub-) section or page and paragraph numbers.
- c. **Utilize writing software to assist your writing.** You may choose to utilize [Grammarly](#), [AJE Free Grammar Check](#), [ProwritingAid](#), or [other top-ranked writing softwares](#) to assist your writing.
- d. **Highly Recommend to Schedule appointments with the university writing centers.** Please schedule an appointment with the university writing centers ([DKU WLS](#) or [Duke TWP](#)) to revise your essay before submission. We highly recommend you make an appointment in advance to avoid any unexpected issues.
- e. **Submission requirements**

You should include


a screenshot of *Grammarly grades* OR an *AJE grammar check report* showing that your writing is almost free from grammar mistakes;

e. g.


Overall score **97**
See performance

Goals 
Adjust goals


All suggestions

Correctness 
Looking good

Clarity 
Very clear

Engagement 
Very engaging

Delivery 
Just right

Premium 
Advanced suggestions

The grammar check screenshot should show that there is no grammar mistake in your essay. And the report from the writing studio should show that you have identified problems and made some progress to improve your writing before handing in your assignments.

Failure or late submission of this file will result in a loss of 3 points.

3. Visualization

- a. Please make one flowchart as a feature photo that shows the logical flow of your essay. You can use [Whimsical](#) to draw the chart. Please put the feature photo below the title of your essay.

For instructions on how to use Whimsical, please watch this [video](#).

- b. Illustrative tables and figures are recommended and required for a high score in the Use of Sources/Documentation part of the rubric. Please remember to add both in-text citations with hyperlinks and a bibliography if you use any table or figure from other resources. Please also label all figures as “Figure X: (the label of your figure)” to clarify.
- c. The illustration must be in high resolution (no screenshots, plot export figure in high resolution from source)

- d. There must be notes directly below the illustrator title to briefly summarize what to learn from the illustrator.
- e. Please number and title all illustrators and provide a note for the sources.
 - i. e.g. source: <https://cbeci.org/index>
 - ii. e.g. created by Plotly
 - iii. e.g. created by Overleaf
 - iv. e.g. created by Whimsical

4. Submission

Please follow all requirements in the document: ECON 211 – Submission Guideline. Any submission failure (late submission or no submission) will cause a certain deduction on your assignment grade or cause issues about academic integrity. Failure in the submission or late submission of the *Grammarly grades or AJE Grammar Check Report* will cause a 3-point deduction; Failure to submit the problem set solution on time or similarity checking score higher than 25% will lead to a 0 grade; Any extra situation will be discussed by the instructor and TAs.

II. Grading Rubric

1. Grading Rubric for writing assignments:

Quality Criteria	No/Limited Proficiency (0–60%)	Somewhat Proficiency (60–80%)	Proficiency (80–90%)	High Proficiency (90–100%)
Thesis/Focus (2')	The thesis is missing or much too ambiguous, or the reader cannot determine the thesis.	The thesis may be too obvious or unimaginative, or loosely related to the writing task.	The thesis and purpose are somewhat original and clear and match the writing task.	The thesis is original and can inspire readers' thinking. The thesis is clear to the reader and closely matches the writing task.

Organization (3')	The overall organization is unclear or it is completely irrelevant to the thesis. No transitions.	Some signs of logical organization. May have abrupt or illogical shifts & ineffective flow of ideas.	Organization can support the thesis. Transitions are almost appropriate. The sequence of ideas could be improved.	Fully supports thesis and writing purposes. The sequence of ideas is effective. Transitions are effective.
Reasoning (3')	Offers simplistic, undeveloped, or cryptic support for the ideas. Exists inappropriate or off-topic arguments, faulty assumptions, errors of fact.	Offers somewhat obvious support that may be too broad. Details are too general, not interpreted, irrelevant to the thesis, or inappropriately repetitive.	Offers solid but less original reasoning. Assumptions are not always recognized or made explicit. Contains some appropriate details or examples.	Substantial, logical, and concrete forms of ideas. Assumptions are made explicit. Details are germane, original, and convincingly interpreted.
Use of Sources /Documentation (2')	Neglects important sources. Overuse of quotations or paraphrases to substitute writer's own ideas. (Possibly uses source material without acknowledgment.)	Uses relevant sources but lacks a variety of sources and/or the skillful combination of sources. Quotations & paraphrases may be too long and/or inconsistently referenced.	Uses sources to support, extend, and inform, but not substitute writer's own development of ideas. Avoid overusing quotes, but may not always conform to the required style manual.	Uses sources to support, extend, and inform, but not substitute the writer's own development of ideas. Combine material from a variety of sources, papers, observation, scientific data, and authoritative testimony. Avoid over

				using quotes.
--	--	--	--	---------------

(Adapted from ECON Writing Rubrics in Northeastern Illinois University)

2. Grading Rubric for Code assignments:

Quality Criteria	No/Limited Proficiency (0-60%)	Somewhat Proficiency (60-80%)	Proficiency (80-90%)	High Proficiency (90-100%)
Code (5')	The program does not work / No answer	The program works but the figure it gets is incorrect; the coding format is good.	The program works but the figure it gets is not completely correct. Code is clean and understandable.	The program works correctly and gets the correct results. Code is clean, understandable, and well-organized.
Explanations for the code (2.5')	The explanation does not make sense / No answer.	The explanation is hard to follow and with some big logical problems in it.	Most of the explanation for the code is accurate but with some problems. The explanation is readable.	The explanation for the code is accurate, readable, and good to follow.

Writing analysis (2.5')	Offers simplistic, undeveloped, or cryptic analysis for the question. Exists inappropriate or off-topic arguments.	Offers analysis that is somewhat too broad. Details are too general, not interpreted, irrelevant questions, or inappropriately repetitive.	Offers solid but less concrete analysis. The answer is not always recognized or made explicit. Contains some appropriate details.	The analysis is logical and concrete with evidence to support it. Details are germane and convincingly interpreted.
--------------------------	---	--	---	---

If you have doubts or concerns about the final grade of your problem set, please contact TAs via email AND send a regrade request in Gradescope after the grade is released.

3. Grading Rubric for presentations and defense

Attributes	Does Not Meet Expectations (60%)	Meet Expectations (80%)	Exceed Expectations (100%)
Overall quality of presentation (40%)	<p>Oral presentation was poorly organized and poorly delivered;</p> <p>Student displayed little or no eye contact with audience or read entire presentation;</p> <p>Visual aids were poorly designed or confusing.</p>	<p>Oral presentation was coherently organized;</p> <p>Hypothesis, approach, results and conclusions were effectively communicated;</p> <p>Visual aids were generally well-designed and added to the presentation.</p>	<p>Oral presentation was well organized;</p> <p>Student was confident in material and able to professionally articulate hypothesis, approach, results and conclusions in an engaging, logical, and thoughtful manner;</p> <p>Visual aids were professional, clear, concise, and appropriate.</p>

Overall breadth of knowledge (20%)	Students fail to adequately understand or explain necessary scientific principles or background information or fail to put the work in an appropriate position.	Students appropriately put the work in perspective of past and present studies in the literature and are capable of introducing and explaining necessary scientific principles.	Students demonstrate a high level understanding of past and current literature and bring together concepts to think deeply about the research topic.
Quality of response to questions (40%)	Student confuses significant concepts; Responses to questions are incorrect, vague or not relevant.	Student responds appropriately address the question; Claims are supported by data or literature citations.	Student responds appropriately to address the question; Many responses demonstrate significant insight into the problem.

4. Grading Rubric for Peer Evaluations

Attributes	Does Not Meet Expectations (60%)	Meet Expectations (80%)	Exceed Expectations (100%)
Content (45%)	Student's description is completely irrelevant to the peer's presentation. Students only describe the advantages or disadvantages in the peer evaluation.	Student's description almost agrees with the peer's presentation. Students fail to describe the advantages or disadvantages comprehensively in the peer evaluation.	Student's description almost completely conforms to the peer's presentation. Students describe the advantages or disadvantages comprehensively in the peer evaluation.
Organization (45%)	There is a lack of components, compared to the inst	Components in the peer evaluation are complete,	Components in the peer evaluation are comprehens

	ruction.	but the organization is confused to the reader.	ive, and it looks concise and clear to the reader.
Courtesy (10%)	Students fail largely to be assertive and constructive in providing feedback that could help the peer improve their work.	Students are a bit ambiguous and destructive in providing feedback to their peers that do not clearly show the direction for further improvements.	Students follow the etiquette to provide assertive and constructive advice that clearly points out the direction for further improvements.

5. Grading Rubric for Response to Comments

Attributes	Does Not Meet Expectations (60%)	Meet Expectations (80%)	Exceed Expectations (100%)
Content (45%)	<p>Student's description is completely irrelevant to the response to comments.</p> <p>Students do not offer any constructive insights to respond to comments.</p>	<p>Student's responses to comments deal with the majority of the points in peer evaluation.</p> <p>Students do not properly use critical thinking skills to respond to comments.</p>	<p>Student's responses to comments deal with all the points in peer evaluation.</p> <p>Students critically respond to the comments given by peers and have a comprehensive reflection in their own presentation afterwards.</p>
Organization (45%)	There is a lack of components, compared to the instruction.	Components in response to comments are complete, but the organization is confused to the reader.	Components in response to comments are comprehensive, and it looks concise and clear to the reader.

Courtesy (10%)	Students fail largely to be assertive, grateful and polite in the response to comments.	Students are a bit ambiguous and rude in response to comments.	Students follow the etiquette to use assertive, polite, grateful words to show respect to their peers in response to comments with a growth mindset.
----------------	---	--	--