# Grading Criteria for the Project Report

**Project Setup & Research Design (20%)**

* Are the research questions clearly defined, coherent, and well-motivated?
* Is the replication goal articulated, and is the extension logically derived from the original study?
* Are the dataset and variables appropriately chosen and justified?
* Is the preprocessing thorough and suitable for the econometric analysis?

**Code Quality & Reproducibility (20%)**

* Does the code run correctly and reproduce the original study’s results?
* Is the code well-structured, documented, and easy to follow?
* Does it follow good coding practices (e.g., clarity, efficiency, modularization)?
* Is the extension properly implemented in the code, and does it integrate well with the replication?

**Econometric Methods & Implementation (25%)**

* Are the applied econometric techniques appropriate for the research question?
* Are the methods correctly implemented, with careful consideration of assumptions and potential biases?
* Are robustness checks performed and adequately discussed?
* Are any limitations in the methodology acknowledged and addressed?

**Interpretation of Results & Critical Discussion (20%)**

* Are the results correctly interpreted, and do they answer the research questions?
* Is the comparison between replication and extension meaningful and well-explained?
* Are potential weaknesses or sources of uncertainty discussed?
* Does the analysis provide insightful economic or policy implications?

**Report (15%)**

* Is the report well-structured, clear, and logically organized?
* Are the findings effectively communicated with appropriate tables, figures, and references?
* Is the writing style precise and adheres to academic standards (e.g., citations, formatting, coherence)?
* Does the report demonstrate a deep understanding of the replicated study and its contribution to the literature?

# Grading Criteria for the Presentation

**Research Design & Project Objectives (25%)**

* Are the research questions and objectives clearly stated and easy to understand?
* Is the motivation for replicating the study well-articulated?
* Is the rationale behind the chosen extension explained and justified?
* Are the key findings from both the replication and the extension presented clearly and concisely?
* Are appropriate visual aids (e.g., tables, graphs, regression outputs) used effectively to support the analysis?

**Methodological Challenges & Solutions (40%)**

* Are the main methodological challenges (e.g., data limitations, econometric assumptions, model selection) clearly identified?
* Are the solutions to these challenges well-justified, with a strong focus on econometric reasoning and implementation?
* Is there a critical reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the applied methods?
* Are robustness checks, alternative specifications, or sensitivity analyses discussed when relevant?
* Are potential limitations and remaining challenges acknowledged in a thoughtful manner?

**Communication & Clarity (20%)**

* Is the presentation well-structured, logical, and easy to follow?
* Are complex econometric concepts explained in an accessible yet rigorous way?
* Are the slides visually clear, well-organized, and free of unnecessary clutter?
* Do presenters engage with the audience, demonstrating confidence and expertise?

**Q&A and Discussion (15%)**

* Do presenters provide clear, well-reasoned responses to audience questions?
* Are answers supported by the presented analysis and econometric concepts?
* Do presenters demonstrate a solid understanding of their methods, results, and potential limitations?
* Are they able to engage in a meaningful discussion beyond what was explicitly presented in the slides?