DSO110 Presentation and Project Submission Rubric					
Final Project: Presentation	**100% Excellent**	**99-90% Proficient**	**89%-69% Novice**	**59% - 0% Poor**	**Total = 5% of Final Grade**
Overall project presentation is professional and has a planned outline.	Demo was clear, professional, and informative. Team or individual had a planned outline and conducted the presentation in a professional manner. If student chose to submit video presentation, the video is easy to hear/see and on par with in-person presentation.	Team or individual conducted a processional presentation and had a planned course of action, but some elements of the presentation were unclear.	Presentation was moderately professional, but there was not a clear plan or course of action from team members.	Presentation was not planned, and was unprofessionally conducted.	2.5% of Final Grade
Final Project: Code Submission					
Submission of all project documents and final code. If you used Tableau, please take screenshots.Your code will be graded on the following five criteria: Questions, Analysis, Results, Readibility, Reproducibility. For Group Projects, there is a 6th critera for Code Reviews.	All of the five of the critera described below are met at level Proficient or higher.	Four of the critera described below are met at level Proficient or higher. One critera is novice or lower.	Three of the critera described below are met at level Proficient or higher. Two critera is novice or lower.	Only two of the critera described below are met at level Proficient or higher. Three critera is novice or lower.	2.5% of Final Grade
Question(s)	Question(s) are well motivated, interesting, insightful, and novel	Question(s) are appropriate, coherent, and motivated	Question(s) are overly simplistic, unrelated, or unmotivated	There are no questions.	
Analysis	Analysis is appropriate, complete, advanced, and informative	Analysis is appropriate	Choice of analysis is overly simplistic or incomplete	There is no analysis.	
Results	Relevant conclusions explicitly tied to analysis and to context. Plots convey information correctly with adequate and appropriate reference information	Conclusions relevant, but partially correct or partially complete. Plots convey information but lack context for interpretation	Conclusions are missing, incorrect, or not based on analysis. Inappropriate choice of plots; poorly labeled plots; plots missing	There is no results.	
Readibility	Code very well organized. No irrelevant or distracting code. Variable and function names have clear relationship to their purpose in the code. Code is easy to read and understand. Verbal presentation is correct, complete, and convincing. Explanation is correct, complete, convincing, and elegant Visual presentation is appealing, informative, and crisp Verbal and visual presentation clearly related	Code is reasonably well organized. There is little unused or irrelevant code, or this code has been moved out of the main project files. Variable and function names generally meaningful and helpful for understanding. Verbal presentation partially correct but incomplete or unconvincing. Explanation is correct, complete, and convincing Visual presentation is readable and clear Verbal and visual presentation related	Code is messy and poorly organized; unused or irrelevant code distracts when reading code. Variables and functions names do not helpful to understand code. Verbal presentation is illogical, incorrect, or incoherent. Explanation is illogical, incorrect, or incoherent Visual presentation is cluttered, disjoint, or illegible Verbal and visual presentation unrelated	There is no code submisison.	
Reproducibility	Recipes additionally validate data against its source (such as URL or other download). The recipes generate all exploratory work and supplementary analysis	Recipes in project directory correctly load data and generate all results and figures in report	Code didn't run	There is no code submisison.	
Code Review (ONLY for group projects)	Extensive evidence that group member or are giving constructive feedback on each other's code, leading to better code.	Some evidence that group members are giving constructive feedback on each other's code, leading to better code.	Little evidence that group members are giving constructive feedback on each other's code.	No evidence that group members are giving constructive feedback on each other's code.	