

Project 3 Grading Rubric

Each aspect of the project will be graded on a competency-based scale ranging from Exceeds expectations to Meets expectations, Needs improvement, Unsatisfactory, and Failing. These levels approximately correspond to grades A, B, C, D, and F, respectively. Half grades may be assigned to work that falls between two proficiency levels.

	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Needs improvement	Unsatisfactory	Failing
Component scores. (Both Part 1 and Part 2 will each be scored by these criteria. Point values apply per part.)					
Introduction	The introduction provides a clear explanation of the question and the dataset used to answer the question, including a description of all relevant variables in the dataset. 5pts	Introduction has minor flaws, e.g. is too short or too long. 4.5pts	Introduction has one major flaw, such as not describing the relevant variables in the dataset. 4pts	Introduction has multiple major flaws. 3pts	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. 0pts
Question	Question is interesting, appropriate for the dataset, and conceptual. 5pts	Question is conceptual and appropriate for the dataset but lacks depth or insight. 4pts	Question is either overly technical or vague, or prompts one particular analysis. 3pts	Question is not a question or does not relate to the given dataset. 2pts	Not attempted. 0pts
Justification of approach	The chosen analysis approach and visualizations are clearly explained and justified. 5pts	Justification of approach has minor flaws, e.g. is too short or too long. 4pts	Justification of approach has one major flaw, e.g. a visualization is not justified or is incorrect. 3pts	Justification of approach has multiple major flaws. 2pts	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. 0pts
Code	Code is correct, easy to read, properly formatted, and properly documented. 5pts	Code is correct but has minor problems with formatting or documentation. 4pts	Code has minor flaws, or is difficult to follow, or includes extraneous parts. 3pts	Code has major flaws. 2pts	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. 0pts

Visualization	The visualizations are appropriate, easy to read, and properly labeled. 10pts	The visualizations have minor flaws, such as minor flaws with legibility or labeling, or the chosen geom is suboptimal. 8pts	At least one visualization has substantial flaws with legibility or labeling, or is confusing. 6pts	At least one visualization has major flaws, i.e., it is barely comprehensible or entirely inappropriate. 4pts	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. 0pts
Discussion of results	Discussion of results is clear and correct, and it has some depth without begin excessively long. 10pts	Discussion of results is mostly clear and correct, but has minor inaccuracies or lacks some depth. 8pts	Discussion has one substantial flaw but is otherwise acceptable. 6pts	Discussion has multiple flaws in logic. 4pts	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. 0pts

Document-wide scores. (These criteria will be applied once to the entire document.)

Reproducibility	All required files are provided. Rmd file knits without issues and reproduces pdf. 10pts	All required files except pdf are provided. Rmd file knits without issues and produces a pdf. 9pts	Rmd requires minor modification to knit without issues (e.g. missing library call or broken file paths), or key datafile is missing. 8pts	Rmd requires major modification to knit without issues. 6pts	Not attempted. 0pts
Presentation	Entire document is well structured and easy to follow. No extraneous materials. 10pts	Document is mostly well structured, but some aspects are confusing or difficult to follow. 8pts	Document has several deficiencies, such as excessive extraneous materials, misplaced figures, code, or text, or is otherwise confusing. 6pts	Document is near impossible to comprehend. 4pts	Incomprehensible/not attempted. 0pts
Points total:	100	82	64	44	0

(Points total counts all component scores twice, once for each part.)