

Course Project Rubric¹

ECN 310 M002, Fall 2025

Your project will be evaluated according to the categories below. Each category is followed by the maximum number of points that can be received in that category. For each category, a project will be given a ranking from 1 to 10 and then weighted by the corresponding point value. For example, *Organization and Synthesis* can receive 20 out of the total of 250 points, so a score of 7 will result in 14 out of 20 points.

Final Submission (125 points)

Components	Sophisticated (10)	Competent (7)	Not yet Competent (3)
<i>Motivation</i> (10 points)	Clearly communicates why the topic is interesting / why the readers should care about it. Project fulfills the request of the faculty sponsor.	Motivation is present; at least some reasonable argument is made. Project broadly speaks to the request of the faculty sponsor.	No clear motivation, or motivation is poor or missing. Project broadly fails to meet the request of the faculty sponsor.
<i>Accuracy</i> (10 points)	Information is accurate. Resources are legitimate when appropriate.	Information is mostly accurate with only a few minor errors. 1 resource may be questionable.	Information is unreliable and/or inaccurate. Resources are not valid.
<i>Reasoning and Analysis</i> (30 points)	Arguments are reasonable and well-justified with evidence from sources or intuition. Extends beyond reference material, providing insightful analysis of complex ideas.	Arguments or positions are reasonable and mostly supported by evidence. In general, displays a clear understanding of the material and concepts.	Positions are often based on opinion or unclear views instead of by evidence. Suggests inability to follow complex lines of argument or arguments are convoluted and difficult to follow.
<i>Organization and Synthesis</i> (20 points)	Submission successfully breaks the project into relevant parts and is logically organized. Integrates analysis into a coherent whole that the reader can easily follow, including references to the reproducibility package.	Submission successfully breaks project into relevant parts; is mostly logically organized; connections between parts are fairly accurate and clear; parts are integrated into a mostly coherent whole. A few minor points may be confusing.	Organization is haphazard. Some parts and the connections between them may be only somewhat accurate, missing or unclear. Reader can follow submission only with effort.
<i>Professional figures</i> (<i>Greenlaw p. 235</i>)	All figures: - have clear title with reference number and clear description; - have a clear role in your “story”	One or two figures - do not have a clear role; - are explained somewhat unclearly in text;	At least one figure is presented in an unprofessional manner; or summary stats are missing; or explanations of multiple figures in text are unclear, missing, or not

¹ Adapted from Huba, M.E., & Freed, J.E. (2000). *Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning* (pp. 156-157). Allyn & Bacon: Needham Heights, MA

(20 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - are explained clearly in text with reference number pointing to it; - (graphs) have axes clearly labeled and units clearly identified; - are presented professionally. Appropriate summary stats are included (usually in a table). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - have missing / incorrect reference number or unclear description; - have unclear axes or units. <p>All figures are presented professionally. Most summary stats of interest are clearly presented.</p>	relevant; several figures do not have clear titles (missing, incorrect, or unclear reference numbers or descriptions) or labeling.
<i>Clarity</i> (20 points)	All sentences are complete and grammatical. All words show precise meanings. All new or unusual terms are well-defined. Key concepts are completely explained. Submission has been spell-checked and proofread and has no errors.	All sentences are complete and grammatical. Most words show precise meanings. Most new or unusual terms are well-defined. Key concepts are completely explained. Submission has been spell-checked and proofread and has few errors.	A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. Words are not chosen for their precise meanings. Many new or unusual terms are not well-defined. Several explanations are inaccurate or incomplete. Submission has several spelling errors.
<i>Citations and academic honesty</i> (10 pts)	All sources are well documented and quoted / paraphrased.	All sources are well documented, but minor mistakes / gaps are present.	Sources are overquoted, documentation hard to follow or poorly cited.
<i>Freedom from Bias</i> ² (5 points)	Language and content are free from bias.	Language and content are free from bias with one or two minor exceptions.	Language and content includes some identifiable bias. Some readers will be offended.

Process and Peer Assessment (45 points)

<i>Process</i> (15 points)	All components turned in on time. Comments on draft analysis section are addressed. All communication regarding the project's progress is clear, respectful, and timely. Appropriate backups in place.	All components are completed and turned in on time. Most comments on draft analysis section are addressed at least in part. Communication regarding the project's progress and backup status is not always clear.	Final submission not on time, or communication about project's progress is either disrespectful or inconsiderately timed. Many comments on draft analysis section not addressed, or backup plans are inappropriate.
<i>Self and Peer Evaluation</i> (5 points)	Self and peer assessment is complete, thoughtful, honest & kind. Assessment submitted on time.	Self and peer assessment is complete and kind, but not fully thoughtful and/or honest. Assessment submitted on time.	Self and peer assessment is not complete, kind, and/or not submitted on time.
<i>Peer Allocation</i> (25 points)	25 points of each member's grade will be determined by a peer review process set out in the Team's contract. In a four-person team, there are $25 \times 4 = 100$ points; peer evaluation will determine how these points are distributed.		

² See <https://writingcenter.ashford.edu/avoiding-bias> and <https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/writingcenter/scholarlyvoice/avoidingbias>

Documentation and Reproducibility (80 points)

Components	Sophisticated (10)	Competent (7)	Not yet Competent (3)
<i>Reproducibility</i> (30 points)	All analysis is easily and fully reproduced using supplied materials.	All analysis is reproducible, but with some difficulty .	Analysis is not reproducible, either due to insufficient or mistaken instructions or missing files.
<i>Organization and Synthesis</i> (20 points)	Documentation / reproducibility package is logically organized. Integrates data work into a coherent whole that the reader can easily follow.	Documentation / reproducibility package successfully is generally logically organized. Most parts are integrated into a mostly coherent whole. A few minor points may be confusing.	Organization is haphazard. Some parts and the connections between them may be only somewhat accurate, missing or unclear. Reader can follow only with effort.
<i>Completeness</i> (20 points)	All steps, including each line (or small group of lines) of code in each do-file, are clearly explained. Key choices (e.g., how to deal with outliers) are well justified.	Almost all steps are clearly explained, or all steps are explained but some lack clarity. Key choices (e.g., how to deal with outliers) are justified.	A significant number of steps are not clearly explained. Some key choices (e.g., how to deal with outliers) are not justified.
<i>Clarity</i> (10 points)	All sentences are complete and grammatical (or in bullet point form). All words are chosen for their precise meanings. Key concepts are completely explained. Submission has been spell-checked and proofread and has no errors.	All sentences are complete and grammatical. Most words are chosen for their precise meanings. Key concepts are completely explained. Submission has been spell-checked and proofread and has very few errors.	A few sentences are incomplete and/or ungrammatical. Words are not chosen for their precise meanings. Many new or unusual terms are not well-defined. Several explanations are inaccurate or incomplete. Submission has several spelling errors.