RUBRIC FOR ASSIGNMENT 2

Criterion	5 or lower	6	7	8	9 or 10
Knowledge of the topic **Weight 20%**	The assignment contains evident logical errors or omissions. The answer, analysis or interpretation is too simple, simplistic or too limited for program or study load. Insufficient ability or fluency on the specific knowledge.	The assignment addresses sufficiently the goals or question(s) with just enough depth and understanding. It does not reflect all material covered. It includes considerable simplifications or shortcuts. Minimum level of adequacy for study load.	The assignment clearly addresses the question(s) or goals. It shows good knowledge of the material covered, awareness and own reflection of the important aspects of the material covered.	Well-considered and well-explained. Interpretation or analyses provide clear evidence of very good knowledge and understanding of the material covered, without being exceptional.	The assignment addresses fully the question(s) or goal. The students fully master the material covered in the course.
Application of knowledge **Weight 35%**	Insufficient ability to apply the knowledge covered. Major flaws.	Sufficient ability to apply the knowledge covered. Despite several flaws in the assignment, the outcome is satisfactory.	Good ability to apply the knowledge covered, with a few oversights.	Very good ability to apply the knowledge covered in the course.	Excellent ability to apply the knowledge covered in the program to different settings/data.
Method/ Algorithm **Weight 35%**	Method poorly used or misused. Evident logical errors or omissions in understanding the theory. Simplistic use of the method – little more than just passing the data into an R package and copy/pasting the results. Poor notation.	The report reflects a sufficient understanding of the algorithm despite lacking depth or breadth. Notation is incomplete or with several mistakes or omissions.	The report reflects a good understanding of the algorithm/method. Notation is complete with few mistakes or omissions.	The report reflects a very good understanding of the algorithm, its boundaries, implications and limitations. Properly addresses methodological issues and technical challenges discussed in class. Notation is complete and correct. No omissions in important aspects of the method.	The report fully reflects a deep understanding of the algorithm/method, assumptions, implications, boundaries and limitations. Addresses methodological issues and technical challenges that go beyond what is covered in this program.
Written communication **Weight 10%**	Unstructured text. Fails to convey the key message of the thesis and/or to address questions. The text does not meet the academic editorial standards.	The text is somewhat unstructured and unclear. The text barely passes the academic editorial standards, as more polishing work is needed.	Overall well written, with occasional typos, or inaccuracies. The text passes the academic editorial standards, although the writing style is mechanical.	Structured text. The text is clear and concise, but here and there more (or less) details could improve the readability. Tables and Figures are self-explicatory and timely introduced in the text. The text meets the academic editorial standards, although the writing style is a bit mechanical at times.	Structured, coherent and polished text. Excellent writing style. The text is accurate, clear and concise, with the right level of detail. Tables and Figures are self-explicatory and timely introduced in the text. The text meets the academic editorial standards.