

Peer Group Project Part 2: Blog

Due by start of class on Tuesday, November 30

Comments

Total Score:

Blog code rubric (20 points)

Code	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Unacceptable
Functionality (10 points)	<i>9-10 points:</i> The code is completely functional and responds correctly producing the correct outputs.	<i>7-8 points:</i> The program is mostly functional and responds correctly producing the correct outputs in most cases. There are minor problems with the program implementation.	<i>4-6 points:</i> The code is marginally functional with numerous errors and/or incomplete code sections.	<i>2-3 points:</i> The code is minimally functional with significant portions of the code missing or incomplete.	<i>0-1 point:</i> The code is not functional, producing no correct outputs, or was not attempted.
Readability (5 points)	<i>5 points:</i> The code is extremely well organized, properly formatted, and easy to follow.	<i>4 points:</i> The code is reasonably easy to read. There are minor formatting problems.	<i>3 points:</i> The code readable only with significant effort. There is little to no proper formatting.	<i>1-2 points:</i> The code is poorly organized and difficult to read. There is little to no consistency in formatting.	<i>0 points:</i> The code is readable only by the author or someone extremely knowledgeable with its layout and purpose.
Documentation (5 points)	<i>5 points:</i> The code is extremely well documented. Comments are completely consistent with the associated code. There are no spelling errors.	<i>4 points:</i> The code is reasonably well documented. There are minor formatting omissions that would have improved users understanding of code purpose. There may be limited spelling errors.	<i>3 points:</i> The code is marginally documented. There are significant portions of the code that are not documented or documented incorrectly. There are significant spelling errors that detract from the documentation.	<i>1-2 points:</i> The code is poorly documented. There are minimal comments and/or the comments are incorrect.	<i>0 points:</i> The code is not documented.

Blog content rubric (30 points)

Content	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Unacceptable
Blog post (Individual) (20 points)	<i>18-20 points:</i> The blog post successfully communicates the goals, procedures and results of the study. Claims are adequately supported. Text and analysis is effectively interwoven. Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	<i>15-17 points:</i> The blog post successfully communicates the goals, procedures and results of the study. Most claims are adequately supported. Text and analysis is effectively interwoven. Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language has few errors.	<i>10-14 points:</i> The blog post communicates the goals, procedures and results of the study. Most claims are adequately supported. Text and analysis may seem disconnected and/or the language used generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	<i>5-9 points:</i> The goals, procedures and/or results of the study are unclear. Most claims are not adequately supported. Text and analysis are disconnected and/or language used sometimes impedes meaning because of error in usage.	<i>0-4 points:</i> The goals, procedures, and/or results of the study are unclear. None of the claims are adequately supported. Language impedes meaning because of error in usage.
Visualization and analysis (13 points)	<i>11-13 points:</i> All analyses and graphical elements included are appropriate for the variables/relationships under investigation. Any underlying assumptions are met, and analyses are carried out correctly. Figures have clear labels and legends, where necessary. An original view of the data is presented.	<i>7-10 points:</i> All analyses and graphical elements included are appropriate for the variables/relationships under investigation. Any underlying assumptions are met, and most analyses are carried out correctly. Labeling and legends not completely clear. An original view of the data is presented.	<i>4-6 points:</i> All analyses and graphical elements included are appropriate for the variables/relationships under investigation. Some underlying assumptions are not met and/or analyses are not carried out correctly. Labeling and legends not completely clear. An original view of the data is presented.	<i>2-3 points:</i> Some analyses and graphical elements included are not appropriate for the variables/relationships under investigation. Some underlying assumptions are not met and/or analyses are not carried out correctly. Unclear labeling and/or legends.	<i>0-1 point:</i> Analyses and graphical elements are not appropriate for the variables/relationships under investigation and/or an original view of the data is not presented.
Originality and creativity (7 points)	<i>6-7 points:</i> The topic is interesting and substantial, and the group demonstrates considerable creativity, initiative and ambition.	<i>4-5 points:</i> The topic is interesting and substantial, and the group demonstrates some creativity, initiative and ambition.	<i>3 points:</i> The topic is interesting, and the group demonstrates limited creativity, initiative and ambition.	<i>1-2 points:</i> The topic is trite, pedantic, or trivial, and the group demonstrates limited creativity, initiative and ambition.	<i>0 points:</i> The topic is trite, pedantic, or trivial, and the group demonstrates no creativity, initiative or ambition.

Presentation rubric (30 points)

Code	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Unacceptable
Team					
Organization (10 points)	<i>9-10 points:</i> Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful, and makes the content of the presentation cohesive	<i>8 points:</i> Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation	<i>7 points:</i> Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation	<i>3-6 points:</i> Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is barely detectable within the presentation	<i>0-2 points:</i> Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation
Content (10 points)	<i>9-10 points:</i> Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported).	<i>8 points:</i> Central message is clear and consistent with supporting material.	<i>7 points:</i> Central message is basically understandable but is not memorable and/or not supported.	<i>3-6 points:</i> Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.	<i>0-2 points:</i> Central message is unclear from the presentation.
Individual					
Language and delivery (10 points)	<i>9-10 points:</i> Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	<i>8 points:</i> Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	<i>7 points:</i> Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	<i>3-6 points:</i> Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	<i>0-2 points:</i> Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience.