Paper	**Exemplary**	**Good**	**Acceptable**	**Needs Work**	**Inadequate**
Introduction	**15**	**12**	**9**	**6**	**3**
	Clearly and concisely describes the data, and why it is of interest. Sets up a clear roadmap for the rest of the paper.	Good introduction to data, but roadmap for rest of paper lacking.	Introduction and roadmap unclear and missing important details.	Rote description of data. No context provided for data or questions.	Fails to introduce data and questions of interest.
Main Body	**20**	**16**	**12**	**8**	**4**
Rigor	Intense exploration and evidence of many trials and failures. You have looked at the data in many different ways before coming to your final answer. You have gone beyond what was asked: additional research from other sources used to help understand/explain findings. Your explanation and presentation is creative.	Plenty of exploration and investigation. Some additional research helps explain findings, and some of your ideas are creatively presented and explained.	Some exploration, but little evidence that you have selected the best of many ideas. Little or no additional research beyond your initial data set.	You have done the bare minimum that was asked. There is no evidence to suggest that you tried multiple approaches (tables, graphics, or wrangling) before coming to your final conclusion.	Questions are simple, and there is no evidence of exploration. You merely present the data as-is with no clear narrative in mind.
Organization	Findings very well organized. Clear headings demarcate separate sections. Excellent flow from one section to the next. The paper is easy to scan. An abstract or summary at the start of the paper briefly summarizes your approach and findings. Conclusions at the end present further questions and suggestions for deeper investigation. Tables and graphics carefully tuned and placed for desired purpose.	Findings well organized and sections clearly separated, but flow is lacking. Each section has clear purpose. Tables and graphics clear and well chosen.	Generally well-organized, but some sections don't have a clear purpose. Tables or graphics appropriate, but some are poorly presented. E.g. too many decimal places, poorly chosen aspect ratio etc.	Sections unclear and no attempt to flow from one topic to the next. Graphics and tables poorly chosen to support questions. Some have fundamental flaws.	It is hard to read your paper. There are no headings, figures are far away from where they are referenced in the text. There is no summary or conclusion.
Questions	All questions are clearly answered. Answers are clear, coherent, and sufficient.	Questions are mostly answered. Some confusion, or missing information.	Questions are addressed, but confusing and missing relevant information.	Questions are poorly answered. No sufficient content.	Questions are not answered.
Conclusion	**15**	**12**	**9**	**6**	**3**
	Conclusions follows logically from results and findings. Includes interesting further questions and ideas for future research.	Good summary, but doesn't pull pieces together into cohesive whole. Interesting ideas for future research	Summary patchy, but some attempt at synthesis and development of ideas for future work.	Repeats findings with no synthesis. No proposals for future work.	Fails to summarise findings or ask more questions.
Presentation	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Text	English is polished, concise and clear. No grammar or spelling mistakes.	Clear and concise, but not elegant. A few spelling and grammatical errors.	Readable, but excessively verbose, or lacking in detail. A number of errors in text.	Marginally readable. Many errors.	Barely readable. Many spelling and grammar errors. No evidence of proofreading.
Graphs	Graphs carefully tuned for desired purpose. Evidence that many graphs were created before choosing one for presentation. Each graph illustrates one point.	Graphs well chosen, but a few have minor problems: inappropriate aspect ratios, poor labels, poor quality when printed.	Most graphs appropriate. Many graphs have minor problems.	Graphs poorly chosen to support questions. Some redundant or fundamentally flawed.	Graphs do not support questions and findings. Major presentation problems.

Coding	**Exemplary**	**Good**	**Acceptable**	**Needs Work**	**Inadequate**
Project Files	**15**	**12**	**9**	**6**	**3**
Organization	Project is clearly organized in the four notebooks, as specified in the instructions. If necessary. the execution is straightforward and requires that the reader only run a few lines of code to assess the code, and test the model.	Most of the project is clearly organized. 1-2 files are not in the right place. The user may be required to modify the code a little to produce the necessary result.	Some organization of the code. May not fully follow instructions. The user must modify the code in several files to get the project to run.	Files are barely organized. File names are poorly chosen. Execution requires that the reader heavily modify the code.	No organization was attempted. Running the code requires that the user basically modify every single file.
Coding Style	**10**		**5**		**0**
Naming Convention	Code follows a uniform naming convention. For example, all functions are in camelcase while other objects are in undercase with underscores separating words. Names are informative.		Naming convention is fairly consistent with some minor inconsistencies (1-3 occurrences). Names are generally informative.		No clear naming convention followed or is inconsistent in more than 3 places. Names are not carefully chosen.
Formatting	Code is always within the 80 character limit per line with the exception of long URLs. Functions and expressions are always organized concisely. Effective use of whitespace to make code readable.		Code occasionally deviates away from the length limits (1-3 occurrences). Whitespace conventions broken in 1-3 places.		Code breaks the width and length style restriction in more than 3 places. Whitespace conventions broken in 3+ places.
Comments	Code has clear and informative comments. Easy to read and understand. All features have a description.		Code has comments that partly help reader to understand the code or partially describe the features.		No comments
Technical Mastery	**40**	**32**	**24**	**16**	**8**
	Code is compact and efficient (in terms of verbosity, not computation time). No unnecessary copy-paste when a suitable function could take care of the task. Features are solid, innovative, and result in an accuracy above our threshold. All models fully trained and evaluated. The code clearly demonstrates mastery of topics covered in this class rather than “hacks” used to patch problems.	Code demonstrates competence of major topics covered in this class. Good set of features and all models fully trained Presence of 1-2 “hacky” solutions that could have been solved in a better way,.	Code shows a basic understanding of topics covered in this class. Naive features, below accuracy threshold, most of the models trained. The code works, but is inelegant in more than 2 places.	Code reveals holes in basic understanding of topics covered in class. <10 features, incorrectly trained models, below accuracy threshold. Code doesn’t work in 1-3 places.	Code only demonstrates very basic functionalities. Lot of missing parts. No or very limited features. Code doesn’t work in at least 3 places.

Team Evaluation	Exemplary	Good	Acceptable	Needs Work	Inadequate
	15	12	9	6*	3**
	Team member contributed heavily to the project without commandeering too much of the work away from others. They offered insight to other members' work and communicated effectively throughout the entire project.	Team member contributed much to the overall success of the project. Sometimes, it seemed as if they didn't effectively communicate what they were doing or tried to take too much upon themselves while leaving others with nothing to do.	Team member contributed what was asked of them and not much more. Another team member had to synthesize parts of their work for the presentation and/or paper, and their code had to be cleaned up. Communication seemed lopsided.	Team member contributed a little to the project, doing some of the coding or just preparing the slides/paper. Communication was hard, and division of labor was unfair.	Team member did nothing.

The teamwork score will be an average of all your team members' evaluations. These evaluations will be done on google forms and due one day after the project deadline.

* If all other members of the team vote this score or lower, then the team member will receive a 50% deduction.

** If the score here is unanimous, then that team member will receive a 0.

Note: Using the test data in any way for training/creating your mode will result in a 0 for the Technical Mastery section.

Note: Working alone will result in a 0 in the Team Evaluation Section

Note: Submitting the partner form after 11/26 will result in a 3 point deduction in the Team Evaluation Section