

# Grading Rubric for Math 352 Projects

April 7, 2014

Project title:

Group member name:

Group member name:

Group member name:

Group member name:

	20 points	15 points	10 points	5 points
<b>Description of the model (20 points)</b>	The description of the model is well-motivated, convincing, clearly conveyed, and tailored to the intended audience of the paper.	The model is described well, but is missing one or two things that the audience would need to know to fully understand.	The model is hastily described or is missing significant details.	The model is ill-defined.
<b>Problem formulation (20 points)</b>	The model is accurately formulated: all assumptions are clearly stated and warranted.	Some unwarranted assumptions were made in the model.	There are some flaws in the formulation of the model.	The model is either largely incorrect or inappropriate for the problem.
<b>Quality of mathematical work (20 points)</b>	The analysis techniques chosen are well-suited to the problem. The calculations performed are thorough, correct, and complete.	The analysis techniques work well for the problem, but there may be other techniques that are superior. The calculations are mostly complete and correct.	The analysis techniques chosen are not well implemented or inappropriate. Some calculations are incorrect.	There are serious mathematical errors that lead to incorrect results.
<b>Insightfulness and depth of understanding (20 points)</b>	Numerous insightful and thoughtful conclusions from data are presented. The authors designed the model and calculations well to reach these conclusions and they learned many things from their model.	Some insightful conclusions are reached through the model and the calculations. There are a few obvious things the authors could have done to draw more conclusions from the model.	The authors make a cursory attempt to draw conclusions from the data. The authors demonstrate a minimal advancement of learning ability through the model.	The write-up gives no insights on the original problem or shows no signs of learning on the part of the authors.
<b>Grammar and mechanics (20 points)</b>	Excellent. The paper is easy to read, with a clear logical structure and few or no misspelled words or other grammatical or typographical errors.	Fair. The logical structure of the paper and the argument is mostly apparent. While there are some errors, there are not too many and they distract from the argument only a little.	Borderline. The argument is haphazardly constructed, with only minimal logical structure. There are many usage errors.	Poorly written. There seems to be no attempt to make the paper coherent as a whole. A great multitude of errors make it unreadable.