

Course Project Rubric¹ -- International Trade Policy

ECN 310 M002, Fall 2023

Overall Evaluation: I want to commend you on the tremendous amount of work that went into this project and how well you worked together as a team, especially on such overwhelming data. At the same time, the final product could have been much better if you had sought more feedback and were more responsive to the feedback you received. The report does not, in the end, clearly explain the evidence you present, making it hard for the reader to know what can be learned from your analysis.

Report (77 out of 140, 55%)

- *Accuracy*: Include theories that are not relevant in abstract and lit review. List Switzerland as a member of the EU.
- *Citations / Academic Honesty*: Data on trade deficit (and others) is included without citation. Many items in the list of references are not cited in the text.
- *Reasoning and analysis*: Data section contains step-by-step instructions for the data work, but nothing about what the variables are (at the very end, it lists four products, which is a start), what they mean, etc.
 - Claims are made that are not supported by evidence, such as the EU being the foremost beneficiary of the US tariffs on China.
 - The Results section is extremely hard to follow, in part because the figures are not directly referenced in the text, but also because there is a nearly two-page tangent about value versus volume measures.
- *Organization and Synthesis*: Flowery language and bombastic claims make it hard to tell what the story is. Hypothesis is not clearly stated until the conclusion (it is stated very clearly in the README on Github). A lot of irrelevant information is included, making it unclear which pieces the reader should follow. Appendix A placeholder left at end of the report
- *Professional figures*: Many Figures do not have clear labeling and are not clearly discussed in the text. Some figures are screenshots
- *Process*: Most of my comments on the analysis draft were ignored. Additional work done after the deadline.

Documentation (52 out of 80, 65%)

- *Reproducibility*:
 - Report can't be reproduced without the .tex file or figures. None of these are in the repo. They are in Overleaf, but the link would not work for other people
 - Same is true of datasets.
 - Some figures are screenshots and therefore not reproducible.
 - R script doesn't have a path, so user doesn't know where to find the file, and this information isn't included in the documentation file either. It has to be inferred from the link in the main README.
 - Figures are not saved, so user doesn't know which ones to save with which file names to be able to produce the report
- *Organization and Synthesis*: Main README is great! Documentation file gives general directions, but does not tell where the files are, what they are called, which variables to analyze. Main folder in Repo has lots of files that are not described; this leads a user to try to figure out what each of them is for.

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

- *Completeness*: Download instructions for the datasets are not included. I wrote the one for you for the Eurostat data, so all you had to do was reference it. Commenting in R script is solid.

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.	5	5
<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.	3	3
<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, 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.	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 argument or arguments are convoluted and difficult to follow.	4	12

<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.	5	10
<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.	3	6
<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.	10	20
<i>Freedom from Bias²</i> (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	All components are completed and turned in on time. Most comments on draft analysis section are addressed at least in part.	Final submission not on time, or communication about project’s progress is either disrespectful or inconsiderately timed. Many	4	6

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

	regarding the project's progress is clear, respectful, and timely.	Communication regarding the project's progress is not always clear.	comments on draft analysis section not addressed.		
--	--	---	---	--	--

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.	6	18
<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.	7	14
<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.	5	10
<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.	10	10