CSCI 538 Final Project Grading Rubrics

Final Presentation Rubrics

	Excellent (100% of the points)	Good (>=80% of the points)	Fair (>=60% of the points)	Needs Improvement (<=59% of the points)
Knowledge and understanding (10 points)	☐ Shows an exceptional understanding of the research question and topics ☐ Main topics or problems are clearly defined ☐ Dataset and research results are well presented and explained ☐ Information is well organized and follows a logical sequence ☐ Size and amount of text are excellent ☐ Supports all the points	☐ Shows a good understanding of the research question and topics ☐ Main topics or problems are defined ☐ Dataset and research results are either presented or explained ☐ Information is organized and follows a logical sequence ☐ Size and amount of text are good ☐ Supports main points	☐ Shows a basic understanding of the research question and topics ☐ Some topics or problems are defined ☐ Dataset or research results are presented but not appropriate. ☐ Information is somehow organized ☐ The size and amount of text are somewhat appropriated ☐ Support some points	☐ Lack of understanding of the research question and topics ☐ Main topics or problems are not defined ☐ Dataset or research results are missing or not appropriate. ☐ Information is not organized ☐ Size and amount of text are bad. ☐ Doesn't support any point
Delivery of information (5 points)	☐ Submits/delivers the presentation in the correct way ☐ Makes good eye contact ☐ Shows enthusiasm ☐ Uses appropriate voice volume ☐ Provides excellent additional explanations ☐ Excellent use of the time	☐ Submits/delivers the presentation in the correct way ☐ Makes eye contact ☐ Shows enthusiasm ☐ Uses good voice volume ☐ Provides additional explanations ☐ Good use of the time	☐ Partial contents were missing ☐ Limited eye contact/ sometimes makes eye contact ☐ Voice volume is not always good. ☐ Barely provides additional explanations ☐ Use of time is not	☐ Either slides or presentation is missing. Or all of them are missing. ☐ Does not make eye contact/ ☐ Barely shows enthusiasm ☐ The voice volume is not good ☐ No additional explanations were provided ☐ Time is not well-used
Teamwork (if applicable) (5 points)	☐ Take an active role; ☐ Allows the others to participate; ☐ Treats the other team members with respect; ☐ Excellent contributions to the group project	☐ Good participation in the project ☐ Most of the time, allows the others to participate ☐ Treats the other team members with respect; ☐ Good contributions to the group presentation	☐ Participated in the project ☐ Let the other contribute ☐ Treats the other team members with respect; ☐ Had some contributions to the group project	☐ Had limited participation in the project/did not participate in the work ☐ Rarely/did not let the others participate ☐ Treat the other team members without respect ☐ Contributed a little /did not contribute to group presentation

Total Points: ___/20

Final Report Grading Rubrics

	Excellent (100% of the points)	Good (>=80% of the points)	Fair (>=60% of the points)	Needs Improvement (<=59% of the points)
Introduction [Introductory paragraph(s), literature review, hypotheses or propositions] (5 points)	☐ Clearly identifies and discusses research focus, purposes, and/or problems. ☐ The research focus is clearly grounded in existing/ previous research/ theoretically relevant literature ☐ The significance of the research can be clearly identified (how it can be added to previous/existing research studies) ☐ Hypotheses/ assumptions/ propositions are clearly articulated	☐ Limited discussion of research focus, purposes, and/or problems. ☐ The research focus is less well-grounded in existing/ previous research/ theoretically relevant literature ☐ The significance of the research is not clearly identified (how it can be added to previous/existing research studies) ☐ Hypotheses/ assumptions/ propositions are described but not as well articulated	☐ Minimal discussion of research focus, purposes, and/or problems. ☐ The research focus is not well-grounded in existing/ previous research/ theoretically relevant literature ☐ The significance of the research is not clearly identified (how it can be added to previous/existing research studies) ☐ Hypotheses/ assumptions/ propositions are not well-articulated	☐ Little or no discussion of research focus, purposes, and/or problems. ☐ The research focus not grounded in existing/ previous research/ theoretically relevant literature ☐ The significance of the research is not identified (how it can be added to previous/existing research studies) ☐ Hypotheses/propositions are poorly articulated or are absent altogether
Research Methods (10 points)	☐ Provides accurate, thorough description of how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, plan of analysis or measurement instrument, research context ☐ Reflection on social situatedness/reflexivity and how it may influence data collection and interpretation is thorough and insightful ☐ In-depth discussion & elaboration in all sections of the paper.	☐ Description of how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, plan of analysis or measurement instrument, research context is adequate but limited. ☐ Reflection on social situatedness/reflexivity and how it may influence data collection and interpretation is adequate but limited ☐ In-depth discussion & elaboration in most sections of the paper.	☐ Description of how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, plan of analysis or measurement instrument, research context is somewhat confusing/not clearly articulated. ☐ Reflection on social situatedness/reflexivity and how it may influence data collection and interpretation is limited and lacks insight ☐ The writer has omitted pertinent content or content runs-on excessively. Quotations from others outweigh the writer's own ideas excessively.	☐ Description of how the data was collected, what/how many data sources were analyzed, plan of analysis or measurement instrument, research context is very confusing/not articulated sufficiently. ☐ Reflection on social situatedness/reflexivity and how it may influence data collection and interpretation is severely limited, lacks insight, or is absent altogether ☐ Cursory discussion in all the sections of the paper or brief discussion in only a few sections.

Criteria	(Excellent)	(Good)	(Fair)	(Poor)
Project development/ Implementation (20 points)	☐ Clearly and effectively define variables, functions, classes, and import modules ☐ Excellent use of white spaces and syntax rules ☐ Include appropriate comments ☐ Creatively organized code and documents ☐ Executable without errors ☐ excellent user prompts and data ☐ Solution is efficient, easy to follow, understand and maintain ☐ excellent use of data structures and suitable algorithms ☐ Delivered on time and in the correct format	☐ Clearly define variables, functions, classes, and import modules ☐ Good use of white spaces and syntax rules ☐ Include some comments ☐ organized code and documents ☐ Executable without syntax errors, but with runtime errors ☐ user prompts and data are reasonable ☐ The solution is fairly efficient ☐ good use of data structures and suitable algorithms ☐ Delivered on time or in the correct format	☐ Define variables, functions, classes, and import modules ☐ Use white spaces and syntax rules correctly ☐ Include fewer comments ☐ code and documents are less organized ☐ Executable with minor syntax/runtime errors ☐ Poor design and inefficient data input/output methods ☐ The solution is acceptable but inefficient ☐ poor use of data structures and suitable algorithms ☐ Delivered with a 1–2 days delay, but in the correct format	☐ poor use of variables, functions, classes, or import modules incorrectly ☐ white spaces are missing, or syntax rules are in the programs ☐ no comments ☐ Disorganized and messy ☐ Inexecutable due to errors ☐ no data input or output ☐ no testing or no input invalidation ☐ difficult to follow and understand. ☐ Delivered with a more than 2-day delay or not in the correct format
Results (10 points)	☐ Results are clearly explained in a comprehensive level of detail and are well-organized ☐ Tables/figures clearly and concisely convey the data. ☐ Statistical analyses (if used) are appropriate tests and are accurately interpreted.	☐ Results are explained but not as clearly, level of detail is not as sufficient, and there are some organizational issues ☐ Tables/figures are not as clear/concise in conveying the data. ☐ Statistical analyses (if used) are appropriate tests but are not accurately interpreted.	☐ Results are not very clearly explained, level of detail is insufficient, and there are more organizational issues ☐ Tables/figures are not clear/concise in conveying the data. ☐ Statistical analyses (if used) are inappropriate tests and/or are not accurately interpreted.	☐ Results are not clearly explained, level of detail is severely insufficient, and there are serious organizational issues ☐ Tables/figures are not clear/concise in conveying the data. ☐ Statistical analyses (if used) are inappropriate tests and/or are not accurately interpreted.
Documentation of Sources, Quality of Sources (5 points)	☐ Cites all data obtained from other sources. APA citation style is accurately used in both text and bibliography. ☐ Sources are all scholarly and clearly relate to the research focus. ☐ More than 5 current sources, of which at least 3 are peer-review journal articles or scholarly books. Sources include both general background sources and specialized sources. All web sites utilized are authoritative.	☐ Cites most data obtained from other sources. APA citation style is used in both text and bibliography. ☐ Sources are primarily scholarly and relate to the research focus. ☐ 5 current sources, of which at least 2 are peer-review journal articles or scholarly books. All web sites utilized are authoritative.	☐ Cites some data obtained from other sources. Citation style is either inconsistent or incorrect. ☐ Sources are not primarily scholarly and relate to the research focus but somewhat tangentially. ☐ Fewer than 5 current sources, or fewer than 2 of 5 are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books. All web sites utilized are credible.	☐ Does not cite sources. ☐ Sources are disproportionately non-scholarly and do not clearly relate to the research focus. ☐ Fewer than 5 current sources, or fewer than 2 of 5 are peer-reviewed journal articles or scholarly books. Not all web sites utilized are credible, and/or sources are not current.

Criteria				
Spelling, Grammar, AI Writing detection AI Misuse, Plagiarism (5 points)	☐ No spelling & grammar mistakes ☐ No AI-tools Misuse ☐ Neither AI writing nor plagiarism are detected ☐ 5 points	☐ Minimal spelling & grammar mistakes ☐ AI Writing detection rate is <5%, and ☐ Similarity score (based on Turnitin similarity report) is less than 10% ☐ -10 points from the total points	☐ Noticeable spelling and grammar mistakes ☐ AI Writing detection rate is in the range of 5% and 20%(inclusive) ☐ Similarity score (based on Turnitin similarity report) is more than 10%, but less than 20% ☐ -20 points from the total points	☐ Excessive spelling and/or grammar mistakes ☐ AI Writing detection rate is more than 20% ☐ Similarity score (based on Turnitin similarity report) is over 20%. ☐ -40 points from the total points
Manuscript Format (5 points)	☐ Title page has proper APA formatting ☐ Used correct headings & subheadings consistently ☐ All material clearly related to subtopic, main topic. Strong organization and integration of material within subtopics. Strong transitions linking subtopics and main topic.	☐ Title page approximates APA formatting ☐ Used correct headings & subheadings almost consistently ☐ All material clearly related to subtopic, main topic and logically organized within subtopics. Clear, varied transitions linking subtopics and main topic.	☐ Title page deviates a bit more from APA formatting ☐ Headings & subheadings less consistent ☐ Most material clearly related to subtopic, main topic. Material may not be organized within subtopics. Attempts to provide variety of transitions	☐ Title page completely deviates from APA formatting ☐ Headings and subheadings completely deviate from suggested formatting or are absent altogether ☐ Little evidence material is logically organized into topic, subtopics or related to topic. Many transitions are unclear or nonexistent.

Additional Comments:

Total Points: ___/60

	100%	>=50%	>=25%	>=0%
Bonus points (10 points)	Creative design and meeting all requirements. Further, extend/ improve the project	Great design and meeting all requirements with some cool features, but failed to extend/ improve the project	Good design without errors. No extension or improvement.	Interesting design but have some syntax /runtime errors. No extension or improvement.

References:

[1]Swygart-Hobaugh, A. J. (Some elements adapted from vom Saal, F., "Scoring Rubric—Scientific Paper"

http://www.biology.missouri.edu/courses/Bio4984_vomSaal/pdf/Sci_Paper_Critique.pdf and Cornell College/Colorado College., "Figure 1:

[2] Research Paper Rubric" http://www.coloradocollege.edu/library/acmassign/tools.html

[3] Whalen, S. "Rubric from Contemporary Health Issues Research Paper" http://academics.adelphi.edu/edu/hpe/healthstudies/whalen/HED601_r2.shtml

[4] Rubric for Research Paper. https://www.k-state.edu/assessment/toolkit/measurement/resrubric.pdf