

Course Project Rubric¹ -- NepoBabies

ECN 310 M002, Fall 2023

Overall Evaluation: The project was well conceptualized and the report was very well-written. This is an impressive piece of work. I have only minor quibbles on the report, and some more substantive comments on the documentation (see below). If you were to address most of the comments, I would be very happy to share the report with Professor Zhu.

Report (133 out of 140, 95%)

- *Reasoning and analysis*: Data section doesn't explain what choices were made in estimating the month hired (although part of this shows up in the discussion, it would be better to have it in the data section and then just refer back to that in the discussion section; also we still need to know precisely what definition you used), and could be clearly about the 30-year-old criterion.
 - Your t-tests, for instance, for whether the proportion of males in nepobabies vs. the sample should be male nepobaby proportion vs male non-nepobaby proportion; your test is counting the male nepobabies twice
- *Organization and Synthesis*: Setup of results section is a little confusing/misleading on the raw numbers vs. proportions analysis.
- *Clarity*: Some super-long paragraphs. A few words could be better chosen. Figures could have improved readability in some places.

Documentation (69 out of 80, 86.25%)

- *Reproducibility*:
 - I could easily find your report from your high-level README (thanks!)
 - I could access the data file on OneDrive, but only if I logged in. It would be better to give a link to where the original file can be downloaded from the GSS website—then you can skip the large file issue altogether since you have the code to cut the file there already.
 - Entering the Stata dates into the Excel file directly is bad for reproducibility, and excessively error prone. Why not just have Stata do this for you?
 - On line 48 of your do file, you can just put the file name since you've already changed to that directory. This means that someone else using the file will not have to change the file path a second time and is WHY we use the cd command in the first place.
 - Same comment for the graph export commands later
 - .dta version of FREDunemploymentrates1960_2022 is not in the repo. I have to import the Excel file and create it myself.
 - Line 64-70, "unemployrate not found"—I replaced with UNRATE and it seemed to work.
- *Organization and Synthesis*:
 - Link to detailed documentation/readme is labeled as "Reproducibility Package", but a package is more than just the document—it's a folder that has all the needed documents in it. It's fine (great, actually, if it works) to have all those files in the main folder of your repo.
 - BUT then you need to move all the intermediate files into a separate folder so someone doesn't have to wade through all of them to see which files are necessary and which aren't
 - In the "Reproducibility Package" file, you give the file name you saved it as (good!) but not the location (bad). You can say something at this point like: "All remaining files are in the main folder of the *course-project-nepobabies* Github repository."
 - There is nothing in your report that tells the reader where to find your documentation.

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:*
 - Line 52 says “* Leaves us with 3,550 observations”, but it’s 3560, and it should be several lines further down
 - Your do-file is otherwise extremely well documented and I have all the pieces I need.

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, 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> (<i>Greenlaw p. 235</i>) (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.	10	20
<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	10	15

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.	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.	9	18
<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.	10	20
<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