Project Grading

There are three parts to the project. They will be weighted at 20%, 40%, and 40% for Part I, Part II, and Part III, respectively.

Part I and Part II will be graded based on the rubric below. Each criterion will be equally weighted.

Criteria	0-40%	50-70%	70-90%	90-100%
Presentation note: you are not expected to spend money on binding etc.	Presentation is sloppy, figures are difficult to read or do not have labels or legends. Poor grammar, missing units. Minimal explanation of procedure.	Presentation is mediocre. Assumptions and steps are missing explanation.	Solutions are well organized and neatly presented. Some assumptions and steps are not clearly explained.	Solutions are well organized and neatly presented. All assumptions and steps are clearly explained.
Analysis	Large mistakes made in the analysis, poor modeling assumptions or math errors.	Errors in assumptions made that affect validity of overall trends. Problems with units.	Minimal modeling assumption errors that would not affect validity of overall trends	All results are reasonable when approached with engineering judgement/back of the envelop calculations. All assumptions are reasonable.
Completnes s	Less than 1/2 complete	Less than 2/3 completed	A minor portion of a problem forgotten	All portions of all problems attempted

Project Grading

Part III will be graded based on the rubric below. Each criterion will be weighted as shown in the table.

Criteria	0-50%	50-70%	70-90%	90-100%
Motivation / rationale for the study (20%)	No apparent purpose for the topic	Topic and associated method of investigation not well planned leading to limited ability to learn.	Rationale for topic not clearly explained, however, methodology leads to significant learning.	Topic is well thought out and investigation will lead to significant learning by the group.
Presentation (30%)	Presentation is sloppy, figures are difficult to read or do not have labels or legends. Poor grammar, missing units. Minimal explanation of procedure.	Presentation is mediocre. Assumptions and steps are missing explanation.	Work in well organized and neatly presented. Some assumptions and steps are not clearly explained.	Work is well organized and neatly presented. All constraints, assumptions, etc are clearly explained and justified.
Analysis (30%)	Large mistakes made in the analysis, poor modeling assumptions or math errors.	Errors in assumptions made that affect validity of overall trends. Problems with units.	Minimal errors in assumptions that would not affect validity of overall trends	All results are reasonable when approached with engineering judgement/back of the envelop calculations. All assumptions made are reasonable.
Conclusions (20%)	Minimal conclusions drawn, only values or results listed	Conclusions only point to trends specific to study with minor discussion of causes	Conclusions translate analysis results into broader engineering concepts	Conclusions are thoughtful and bring together multiple earthquake engineering concepts