

# Grading Scheme ABM Project

Michael Lees  
Computational Lab  
Draft 1.1  
`m.h.lees@uva.nl`

January 7, 2019

## 1 Introduction

This document outlines the grading scheme for the ABM project course. In total the project accounts for 70% of the course grade.

The submission includes two parts:

- A report in the ODD+D format [1]
- The code of your model with comments and instructions

The grading scheme is divided into three parts:

- Overall Achievement (30%) - a single score indicating the amount of work achieved and the effort made. This is assessed by looking at the project as a whole and what was achieved.
- Report (45%) - An assessment of the submitted report (see section 2)
- Presentation (10%) - An assessment of the presentation (see section 4)
- Code/Implementation (15%) - An assessment of the submitted code and its features (see section 3)

## 2 Report

The report for the thesis should follow the ODD+D format, please read [1] for the details. The contents and structure of the report will be assessed according to the rubric in table 1. The three columns represent excellent, good and sufficient/poor. Within each scoring category a final grade will be given somewhere in the specified range. The weighting of each category is provided in the final column.

## 3 Code/Implementation

You will also be asked to submit your code to be assessed. This will be assessed for its features, working state and its relevance/contribution to the community. An excellent implementation should be to a standard that other students and or modellers can use it easily. You should make clear what parts of the code you have developed and which parts you have used from others. Please be sure to make clear any libraries that are required to run the simulation - the best way to do this is with a readme.

A rubric is provided in table 2 for the implementation assessment.

## 4 Presentation

Each group has 12 minutes to present + 3 minutes for questions on the final day.

The presentation should cover all the essential parts of the project

1. What is the problem and Why is it important
2. What is (novel in) the approach (description of data/model)
3. What are the questions asked of the model (experiments)
4. Results
5. Conclusions and Future Work

A rubric is provided in table 3 for the presentation assessment.

## References

- [1] Volker Grimm et al. “The ODD protocol: A review and first update”. In: *Ecological Modelling* 221.23 (2010), pp. 2760–2768. ISSN: 0304-3800. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2010.08.019>. URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S030438001000414X>.

Grade				
Criteria	Excellent (8-10)	Good (6-7)	Poor (5)	Weight
Problem statement	Clearly, concisely and scientifically stated	Stated, but slightly vague in parts	Poorly or not stated	5%
Background information	Provide, complete but concise, well structured overview of topic	Provides good background, but perhaps verbose, incomplete or suffers from poor flow	Important background missing	5%
References/Literature	All major literature is covered correctly	Gets some literature but misses parts	Only provides minimal or unrelated literature	10%
Organisation/ODD format	Follows ODD+D and paper is well organised	Most of ODD+D, some sections misplaced	either misses ODD+D or poorly structured paper	5%
Methodology (is the model clearly described)	Described to a standard that allows repetition of work	Most of the model components described, some missing	Major parts of the model missing or poorly described	20%
Experimental Design (is the right analysis done)	Experiments are clearly described and cover all important aspects	Experiments description is lacking or some important experiments missing	Poorly described and missing important parts	20%
Experimental Analysis (are the experiments done/analysed right)	All experiments show excellent scientific analysis and statistics	Analysis is done, but missing statistical or scientific analysis	No analysis or very poor analysis	20%
Conclusions & future work	Conclusions are strong and insightful, future work is clearly described	Conclusions are ok, some future work is mentioned	Conclusions are missing or weak, future work poorly described	10%
Layout & Figures	Report layout and typesetting is excellent	Some parts of the layout/figures are weak	Most of the report is poorly typeset and figures lack quality and labels/axes/etc	5%

Table 1: Grading Rubric Report

<b>Grade</b>				
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Excellent (8-10)</b>	<b>Good (6-7)</b>	<b>Poor (5)</b>	<b>Weight</b>
Code Correctness	Runs without issue and clear instruction	Works with some minor changes or instructions unclear	No clear instructions given	10%
Readability	Code is well structured and easy to read	Minor issues related to layout, naming of variables	Significant issues with layout and naming	10%
Design	Code is properly broken down into classes/methods/etc	Some methods/-classes but some too long or over complicated	No real code design, one large file	10%
Documentation	Code is fully commented and comments are correct, readme included	Some functions/methods not properly commented	Major parts of the code miss comments or many comments not updated	20%
Interface	Very nice interface for demonstrating the model (perhaps online) excellent teaching tool	Some nice features or basic Interface	Command line only	15%
Analysis Tools	Code provides very nice features for analysing results/-experiments	Code can generate output in some format other than plain text	Code prints to screen or unstructured plain text file	15%
Contribution/ Dissemination	Code is contributed to online project	Code is available online	No attempt to share code	20%

Table 2: Grading Rubric Code

<b>Grade</b>				
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Excellent (8-10)</b>	<b>Good (6-7)</b>	<b>Poor (5)</b>	<b>Weight</b>
Organisation	Logical structure, Easy to follow, appropriate for audience	Mostly logical and generally easy to follow	Messy structure, argument in wrong order	25%
Content	All important parts included no unnecessary slides	Most important parts included only a few unnecessary parts	parts missing or inaccurate, irrelevant things included	50%
Delivery	Eye contact, clear voice, engaged speaking, appropriate visual aids	Generally well delivered, clear voice, looking at the audience occasionally	Hard to understand, little eye contact	25%

Table 3: Grading Rubric Presentation