| **Instructions:**  Evaluate the student’s submitted Project 1 assignment and presentation against the outlined criteria in the rubric below and assign a rating to each criterion. Add points earned across all criteria and convert the total points to a letter grade using the *Recommended Final Project Scoring Breakdown*.  **Note:**  We encourage students to collaborate and share ideas during the project weeks. Therefore, you may notice shared code, documentation, and/or write-up explanations across student submissions. This is acceptable and should be a consideration when assigning a rating to the student’s performance. | **Recommended Final Project**  **Scoring Breakdown**   | **Total Rubric Points Achieved** | **Project Grade** | | --- | --- | | 90 or more | A | | 80–89 | B | | 70–79 | C | | 60–69 | D | | 59 or less | F | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

**Rubric for Project 1:**

|  | **Proficiency**  **20 points** | **Approaching Proficiency**  **17 points** | **Partial Proficiency**  **14 points** | **Emerging**  **12 points** | **Incomplete** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Completed Analysis Uploaded to GitHub** | √ Final data analysis contains ample and complete information in README file  √ Final repository is acceptable for professional quality presentation | √ Final data analysis contains basic information in README file  √ Final repository is acceptable but needs more work toward professional quality | √ Final data analysis contains minimal information in README file  √ Final repository needs ample work towards professional quality | √ Empty README | No submission was received  -OR-  Submission was empty or blank  -OR-  Submission contains evidence of academic dishonesty |
| **Visualizations** | √ 6–8 visualizations of data (at least two per question)  √ Clear and accurate labeling of images  √ Visualizations supported with ample and precise explanation | √ 80% of visualizations of data complete (not all questions supported with images)  √ Minimal labeling of images  √ Visualizations supported with basic explanation | √ 60% of visualizations of data complete  √ Inaccurate or no labeling of images  √ Visualizations have minimal or incomplete explanation | √ 0–2 visualizations  √ No labeling of images  √ No explanation of images |
| **Analysis and Conclusion** | √ Write-up summarizes major findings and implications at a professional level  √ Each question in the project proposal is answered with precise descriptions and findings  √ Findings are strongly supported with numbers and visualizations  √ Each question response is supported with a well-discerned statistical analysis from lessons (e.g., aggregation, correlation, comparison, summary statistics, sentiment analysis, and time series analysis) | √ Write-up sufficiently summarizes findings and implications  √ Each question in the project proposal is answered but could use more description and analysis  √ Findings are sufficiently supported with numbers and visualizations  √ Each question response is supported with a statistical analysis but lacks accuracy in application | √ Write-up lacks sufficient summary and needs more coherence to data and findings  √ Responses to questions are minimal  √ Visualizations do not pertain to questions  √ Each question response does not relate to the questions and demonstrates minimal analysis | √ Write-up does not summarize findings and implications; there is no analysis  √ Responses to questions are missing or not relevant    √ Very few to no visualizations  √ No evidence of statistical analysis |
| **Group Presentation** | √ All group members spoke during the presentation  √ Group was well prepared    √ Presentation is relevant to material  √ Presentation maintains audience interest | √ All group members spoke but didn’t split time equally  √ Group was mostly prepared, with minor hiccups  √ Presentation was almost entirely relevant | √ Some group members barely spoke, others spoke for much longer  √ Group was fairly well prepared but encountered some major hiccups  √ Presentation was mostly relevant | √ Not all group members spoke during the presentation.  √ Group seemed unprepared, the presentation was scattered or confusing.  √ Presentation was not relevant to material |
| **Slide Deck** | √ Slides are visually clean and professional  √ Slides are relevant to material  √ Slides effectively demonstrate the project  √ Slides are clear and maintain audience interest | √ Slides are visually clean and professional but contain minor areas for improvement  √ Slides are almost entirely relevant to material  √ Slides are mostly effective at demonstrating the project | √ Slides are visually clean and professional but contain areas for improvement  √ Slides are somewhat relevant to material  √ Slides are somewhat effective at demonstrating the project | √ Slides are not visually clean and professional and contain substantial areas for improvement  √ Slides are not relevant to material  √ Slides do not effectively demonstrate the project |