Case Study I Rubric

Math 315, Fall 2019

(10) Introduction

- (5) Does the introduction have a logical organization? Does it move from the general to the specific? Is necessary background information included? Is it clear what the data set contains?
- (5) Does the introduction state the goal in a way that is easily understood?

(30) Model specification

- (5) Is formal mathematical notation used? Is it clear?
- (5) Is the likelihood clearly discussed and defined?
- (5) Is the prior distribution for μ clearly defined and justified?
- (5) Is the prior distribution for σ^2 clearly defined and justified?
- (10) Is the posterior correctly derived?

(15) Computation

- (5) Is an outline of how the posterior distribution was computed given?
- (10) Given the model specification, is the posterior correctly computed?

(20) Results

- (5) Is the posterior distribution of μ summarized?
- (5) Is the posterior distribution of σ^2 summarized?
- (10) Are the posterior distributions clearly discussed? Is the reader told what has been learned from this analysis?

(5) Prediction

- (5) Is a prediction for a future Math 215 student correctly computed and discussed?

(2) Technical requirements

- (1) Is the page limit met?
- (1) Is the report properly formatted?

(9) Figures and tables/summaries

- (3) Are all figures properly polished and appropriately sized?
- (3) Are all tables/summaries properly formatted and polished?
- (3) Are all figures/tables properly referenced in the text? A reader should be told the "so what" message of any figure/table.

(9) Writing quality

- (3) Is the paper well organized? (Paragraphs are organized in a logical manner)
- (3) Is each paragraph well written? (Clear topic sentence, single major point)
- (3) Is the paper generally well written? (Good use of language, sentence structure)