

Rubric Criteria →  Levels of Mastery ↓	Manipulating & Visualizing Data	Performing Calculations & Simulations	Thinking Statistically	Navigating Quantitative Problems
<b>Good</b>  (Solid performance with occasional or small mistakes.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can manipulate data into useful formats with minimal errors.</li> <li>Can use the full functionality of built-in Python functions and some custom modifications to make figures.</li> <li>Figures are interpretable and effectively show a quantitative feature or result.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can perform most calculations, including calculations of novel quantities, without errors.</li> <li>Can perform most <i>in silico</i> experiments and implement several simulation algorithms without major errors.</li> <li>Code can be understood and interpreted by most users.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can usually identify quantitative phenomena and generate well-supported hypotheses for their distributions.</li> <li>Can pose most problems in terms of a hypothesis test.</li> <li>Can consistently identify the quantitative limitations of estimates due to the nature of the data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can develop a few problem-solving strategies for most problems.</li> <li>Can articulate several differences between the efficacy, consistency, or efficiency of solutions.</li> <li>Can usually determine an “optimal” plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Novice</b>  (Achieves a basic level of success, makes some errors, and struggles with more complex tasks.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can usually manipulate data into useful formats with some errors.</li> <li>Can use some of the functionality of built-in Python functions and minimal modifications to make figures.</li> <li>Figures are interpretable, but do not consistently illustrate a quantitative feature or result.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can use built-in functions to make calculations, but may make errors when performing “custom” calculations.</li> <li>Can perform simple simulations but may make errors with more complicated <i>in silico</i> experiments.</li> <li>Code may be difficult for readers to understand or interpret.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can sometimes identify quantitative phenomena and can generate hypotheses for their distributions with few inappropriate assumptions.</li> <li>Can sometimes pose a problem in terms of a hypothesis test.</li> <li>Can identify some of the limitations of estimates due to the nature of the data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can develop a problem-solving strategy for some problems.</li> <li>Can only articulate superficial differences between the efficacy, consistency, or efficiency of solutions.</li> <li>Can sometimes determine an “optimal” plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Weak</b>  (An attempt was made but significant errors prevent success.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cannot consistently manipulate data into useful formats without errors.</li> <li>Cannot consistently use built-in Python functions to make figures. Cannot make meaningful modifications to these methods.</li> <li>Figures are sometimes interpretable. Figures do not illustrate a quantitative feature or result.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can use built-in functions to make calculations with errors, but cannot perform “custom” calculations.</li> <li>Can perform simple simulations with some errors, but not more complicated <i>in silico</i> experiments.</li> <li>Code is difficult for readers to understand or interpret.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can sometimes identify quantitative phenomena, but cannot generate hypotheses for their distributions without inappropriate assumptions.</li> <li>Make significant errors when trying to pose a problem in terms of a hypothesis test.</li> <li>Makes frequent errors when trying to identify the limitations of estimates due to the nature of the data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can develop problem-solving strategies but with major flaws.</li> <li>Makes frequent errors when trying to articulate differences between the efficacy, consistency, or efficiency of solutions.</li> <li>Makes critical mistakes when trying to determine an “optimal” plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Poor</b>  (No attempt was made. Knowledge and skills are absent.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cannot manipulate data into useful formats.</li> <li>Cannot consistently use built-in Python functions to make figures.</li> <li>Figures are not interpretable or meaningful.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cannot perform calculations at all or cannot do so without significant errors.</li> <li>Cannot carry out <i>in silico</i> experiments or simulations.</li> <li>Code is very difficult or impossible for readers to understand.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cannot quantitative phenomena or generate hypotheses for their distributions.</li> <li>Cannot pose a problem in terms of a hypothesis test.</li> <li>Cannot identify the limitations of estimates due to the nature of the data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cannot develop a problem-solving strategy.</li> <li>Cannot differentiate between the efficacy, consistency, or efficiency of solutions.</li> <li>Cannot determine an “optimal” plan.</li> </ul>