|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent  (85-100%) | Proficient  (70 – 84%) | Needs Work  (50 – 69%) | Unacceptable  (0 – 49%) |
| Quality of Writing  (10 pts) | *The response is well-written and clear with virtually no spelling or grammatical errors. It can be easily read in a timely manner and conveys its message clearly to the reader. The report is written for a general audience.* | *The response is sufficient for understanding; it may contain errors and/or may require some concentration on behalf of the reader to understand the idea(s) presented.* | *The response contains grammatical, spelling, or expositional issues that interfere with the ability of the reader to clearly understand the ideas of the answer.* | *The answer lacks complete sentences, is unclear, missing, or appears plagiarized or AI generated.* |
| Answer  (20 pts) | *The answer provided is compelling, complete, accurate, and thoroughly addresses the objectives listed in the prompt and contains all the deliverables. The code is neatly presented, well-organized, and properly commented with documentation strings where relevant. Variable and function names are clear, sensible, and make for easy reading on the code.* | *The answer provided addresses the prompt, but it may not fully address some of the objectives or may be missing a few elements. The code is neat and well organized, but may appear unedited in portions or lack clarity. Variable and function names may be vague. There may also be erroneous code that shouldn’t be present in a deliverable.* | *The answer does not fully address the prompt but provides a good start. The code is provided but may not be complete.* | *A definitive answer is either missing or contains a significant amount of* ***irrelevant******information*** *or appears plagiarized or AI generated. The code is incomprehensible departs dramatically from what has been done in examples, or appears plagiarized or AI generated.* |
| Justification and Supportive Evidence  (10 pts) | *The answer is supported by calculations and relevant content from the class, textbook or credible outside materials. Examples are sufficiently descriptive that a reader could construct or imagine them without difficulty. Content referenced* | *The answer provides supportive evidence for its assertions, but either not enough or the evidence provided is not sufficiently concrete.* | *The answer provides clear, concrete supportive evidence only for some of its assertions, but is either missing evidence in key parts or the evidence provided in some parts is insufficient for the argument.* | *No clear, concrete justification is provided for the answer; the justification provided is irrelevant; the justification appears plagiarized or AI generated.* |
| Organization  (5 pts) | *The text is very well organized with formatting that makes it both easy to both read and skim.* | *The text is organized, making it flow nicely, but may not use formatting to facilitate skimming.* | *The text is not fully organized. It is clear what text applies to what portion of the prompt without extra effort on the part of the reader.* | *The text is disorganized, hard to follow, and/or appears to be copy-pasted from one or more outside sources or appears AI generated.* |
| Citations  (5 pts)  *Note: If no citations are warranted, the writer can receive full credit here.* | *Citations are provided where needed to help explain concepts or reference ideas. Citations are not overly complicated but clearly indicate where information can be found.* | *Citations are present but perhaps lacking or excessive.* | *Citations are insufficient (too much or too little) and overly complicated, making it hard to look them up and check.* | *Text either has no citations, references, or links for concepts discussed OR contains citations that do not actually cite what it claims (i.e., bogus citations).* |