

Course Project Rubric¹ -- Migration

ECN 310 M002, Fall 2023

Overall Evaluation: The report was very well-written, and the data accomplishment alone impressive. If you were to address most of the comments, I would be very happy to share the report with Professor Pearson.

Report (126 out of 140, 90%)

- *Accuracy*: I think you're wrong in stating that there is no variable for current residence (see link in PDF comment)
- *Reasoning and analysis*: Correlation coefficients would have strengthened your argument. The argument on the bottom of page 8 about migration rates declining after 1970 is confusing.
- *Organization and Synthesis*: Report Title is misleading. Much of the material in data section belongs in a Data Appendix or documentation. Nothing in the paper points to where your files are, although you mention that you have a Github repository.
- *Professional figures*: Figures are too small to read easily
- *Clarity*: Very well written and easy to follow for the most part. There are a few word choices that could be better is all.
- *Process*: Updates after deadline.

Documentation (60 out of 80, 75%)

- *Reproducibility*: Instructions are missing for how to save the Excel graphs as the PNG files used in the report, or where to save them
 - I don't see anything in the documentation about where the files for creating your final report are (I found them on OneDrive after some digging)
 - I can't quite follow the instructions at the end of the README to create the tables in Excel. For instance, I don't know what the tables are supposed to look like for the step "Rearrange the two tables by racial group (instead of by what data they display, like they are currently). There should now be three tables."
 - (We've already discussed this, so just leaving it here for completeness) Having to do this manually between Stata and Excel is bad for reproducibility.
- *Organization and Synthesis*: A master do-file that runs all the different do-files one by one would make this much easier for someone to replicate. I would also prefer a short README in the Github main page that explains the file structure and where the key files are, then the more detailed one in the OneDrive folder. As it is, there's nothing in the OneDrive folder (that I can see easily) that would give the full set of instructions.
 - Nothing in the paper points to where your files are, although you mention that you have a Github repository (impacts organization in both the paper and the documentation).
- *Completeness*: I think all the key pieces are there, except the code you wrote at the end of each do-file is not commented at all. This is ameliorated to some extent by the explanations in the README, but it should also be in each file—especially given that someone working in OneDrive doesn't have any way to know where this explanation on Github is.

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

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.	8	8
<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, 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.	9	27

<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.	9	18
<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.	9	18
<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.	9	18
<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	8	12

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.	9	18
<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