

Course Project Rubric¹ -- Dementia

ECN 310 M002, Fall 2023

Overall Evaluation: The report was pretty well done. You made some truly great figures to display your results and most of the argumentation was great. There were some places where your interpretation of the evidence could be significantly improved. There were also some organizational issues that make the report somewhat hard to follow. The documentation was sufficient to reproduce your results, but with quite a bit of difficulty (and I'm not sure that someone else who was not familiar with your project could have done it).

Report (112 out of 140, 80%)

- *Reasoning and analysis:* In some places, the argument was great; in others, like the interpretation of the tables, the argument was off a bit (focusing on the number of people instead of the proportion). There was pretty strong evidence for your hypothesis in the tables, but the interpretation was off a bit so your argument for the hypothesis was not as strong. The discussion of Figure 6 indicates that somehow the table showing the relationships between dementia diagnosis and being forgetful would support your hypothesis directly, whereas it's just evidence that using the forgetfulness measure makes sense if dementia is what you're trying to learn about. Evidence was missing on basic facts (summary statistics) about the variables that a reader needs to judge whether they think your analysis is valid. Data section generally under-developed.
- *Organization and Synthesis:* Analysis figures were in data section, as well as discussion of the correlation analysis. Figures were all clumped together, and not in the order in which they were discussed in the text. Otherwise, good organization and strong synthesis. Literature review section was one huge paragraph.
- *Professional figures:* I already took off for the summary stats being missing in the Reasoning and Analysis section, but the correlation table does not have a reference number or title, and the tables have unclear labelling. The issue with the spacing of the years of education on the x-axis in the histogram of years of education is not fixed. Figure 3 and Figure 5: x-axis should be labeled with something like "Years of Education"
- *Clarity:* Literature review uses paper titles instead of author names; several sentences of the instructions from the template are included; I've marked a few other usage issues throughout the text.
- *Process:* Summary statistics were not added, graphs weren't integrated into the text or put in the correct section.

Documentation (63 out of 80, 78.75%)

- *Reproducibility:*
 - Link to full dataset in README requires log in (not accessible to someone else). Better to provide a simple link using [these directions](#).
 - Link to "reproducible do file" in README is broken. Without the name of the file, a reader has to guess what it's called and hope they pick the right one.
 - I had to change line 18 of the do-file in two ways: once to change my file path, and second to add the sub-folder name. The first is annoying but can be easily fixed. The second is egregious—someone has to know where to find the correct file in order to fix it.
 - None of the commands to save the outputs are included. To use this do-file to reproduce your report, one would have to guess at the mappings between each table and add commands to save each one with the correct name.
 - There is nothing in your data section or data appendix to tell the reader where to find your reproducibility package.
- *Organization and Synthesis:*

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

- I know to go into the *DIOP Final Submission & Packages* folder to find the do-file, but your README doesn't indicate that that's where the final files are. The default would be to look at the files in the main repository.
 - This means it would be better (as I instructed in class) to hide away all the files that are NOT needed to reproduce the output in some kind of "working" folder and put the files needed for reproducibility into the main folder.
- In general, there's a LOT going on in your repository, and someone who needed to figure out how to reproduce your project would have a LOT of work to do and guesses to make to get it done.
- **Completeness:**
 - There are a lot of commands in the do-file (for instance, the ones that create three tables) where the comment says what it does literally, but without clearly explaining either what the variables mean OR how this gets used in the report.
 - There's nothing in your documentation about how the causal diagram was created and saved so you could put it in the report

Below are the categories on which your project will be evaluated. 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 220 points, so a *Organization and Synthesis* score of 7 will result in 14 out of 20 points.

Final Submission (140 points)

Components	Sophisticated (10)	Competent (7)	Not yet Competent (3)	Out of 10	Scaled
<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.	10	10
<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.	10	10
<i>Citations / academic honesty</i> (10 points)	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.	10	10
<i>Reasoning and Analysis</i> (30 points)	Arguments or positions are reasonable and well-justified with evidence from sources or intuition. Extends beyond reference material.	Arguments or positions are reasonable and mostly supported by evidence. In general, displays a clear understanding of the material and concepts.	Contributions are more often based on opinion or unclear views than on reasoned arguments. Positions not supported by evidence. Suggests inability to follow complex lines of	7	21

	providing insightful analysis of complex ideas.		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.	Submission successfully breaks the project into relevant parts and is generally logically organized. Connections between parts are fairly accurate, generally clear and 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 submission only with effort.	8	16
<i>Professional figures</i> (Greenlaw p. 235) (20 points)	All figures: - have clear title with reference number and clear description; - have a clear role in your “story” - 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).	One or two figures - do not have a clear role; - are explained somewhat unclearly in text; - have missing / incorrect reference number or unclear description; - have unclear axes or units. All figures are presented professionally. Most summary stats of interest are clearly presented.	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 relevant; several figures do not have clear titles (missing, incorrect, or unclear reference numbers or descriptions) or labeling.	7	14
<i>Clarity</i> (20 points)	All sentences are complete and grammatical. All words are chosen for their 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 are chosen for their precise meanings. Most new or unusual terms are well-defined. 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.	7	14

<i>Freedom from Bias</i> ² (e.g., sexism, racism, etc.) (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.	10	5
<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.	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 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.	8	12

Documentation and Reproducibility (80 points)

Components	Sophisticated (10)	Competent (7)	Not yet Competent (3)	Out of 10	Scaled
<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.	7	21
<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 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.	8	16
<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.	8	16
<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	All sentences are complete and grammatical. Most words are chosen for their precise meanings. Key concepts are completely explained. Submission has been	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	10	10

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

	has been spell-checked and proofread and has no errors.	spell-checked and proofread and has very few errors.	explanations are inaccurate or incomplete. Submission has several spelling errors.		
--	---	--	--	--	--