

## Project 1 Grading Rubric

Each aspect of the project will be graded on a competency-based scale ranging from Exceeds expectations to Meets expectations, Needs improvement, Unsatisfactory, and Failing. These levels approximately correspond to grades A, B, C, D, and F, respectively. Half grades may be assigned to work that falls between two proficiency levels.

	<b>Exceeds expectations</b>	<b>Meets expectations</b>	<b>Needs improvement</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>Failing</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	The introduction provides a clear explanation of the question and the dataset used to answer the question, including a description of all relevant variables in the dataset. <b>5pts</b>	Introduction has minor flaws, e.g. is too short or too long. <b>4pts</b>	Introduction has one major flaw, such as not describing the relevant variables in the dataset. <b>3pts</b>	Introduction has multiple major flaws. <b>2pts</b>	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. <b>0pts</b>
<b>Justification of approach</b>	The chosen analysis approach and visualizations are clearly explained and justified. <b>5pts</b>	Justification of approach has minor flaws, e.g. is too short or too long. <b>4pts</b>	Justification of approach has one major flaw, e.g. a visualization is not justified or is incorrect. <b>3pts</b>	Justification of approach has multiple major flaws. <b>2pts</b>	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. <b>0pts</b>
<b>Code, Q1</b>	Code is correct, easy to read, properly formatted, and properly documented. <b>10pts</b>	Code is correct but has minor problems with formatting or documentation. <b>8pts</b>	Code has minor flaws, or is difficult to follow, or includes extraneous parts. <b>6pts</b>	Code has major flaws. <b>4pts</b>	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. <b>0pts</b>
<b>Code, Q2</b>	Code is correct, easy to read, properly formatted, and properly documented. <b>10pts</b>	Code is correct but has minor problems with formatting or documentation. <b>8pts</b>	Code has minor flaws, or is difficult to follow, or includes extraneous parts. <b>6pts</b>	Code has major flaws. <b>4pts</b>	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. <b>0pts</b>
<b>Code, Q3</b>	Code is correct, easy to read, properly formatted, and properly documented. <b>10pts</b>	Code is correct but has minor problems with formatting or documentation. <b>8pts</b>	Code has minor flaws, or is difficult to follow, or includes extraneous parts. <b>6pts</b>	Code has major flaws. <b>4pts</b>	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. <b>0pts</b>
<b>Visualization, Q1</b>	The visualization is appropriate, easy to read, and properly labeled. <b>10pts</b>	The visualizations has a minor flaw, such as with legibility or labeling, or the chosen geom is suboptimal. <b>8pts</b>	The visualization has a substantial flaw with legibility or labeling, or is confusing. <b>6pts</b>	The visualization has a major flaw, i.e., it is barely comprehensible or entirely inappropriate. <b>4pts</b>	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. <b>0pts</b>
<b>Visualization, Q2</b>	The visualization is appropriate, easy to read, and properly labeled. <b>10pts</b>	The visualizations has a minor flaw, such as with legibility or labeling, or the chosen geom is suboptimal. <b>8pts</b>	The visualization has a substantial flaw with legibility or labeling, or is confusing. <b>6pts</b>	The visualization has a major flaw, i.e., it is barely comprehensible or entirely inappropriate. <b>4pts</b>	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. <b>0pts</b>
<b>Visualization, Q3</b>	The visualization is appropriate, easy to read, and properly labeled. <b>10pts</b>	The visualizations has a minor flaw, such as with legibility or labeling, or the chosen geom is suboptimal. <b>8pts</b>	The visualization has a substantial flaw with legibility or labeling, or is confusing. <b>6pts</b>	The visualization has a major flaw, i.e., it is barely comprehensible or entirely inappropriate. <b>4pts</b>	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. <b>0pts</b>
<b>Discussion of results</b>	Discussion of results is clear and correct, and it has some depth without begin excessively long. <b>10pts</b>	Discussion of results is mostly clear and correct, but has minor inaccuracies or lacks some depth. <b>8pts</b>	Discussion has one substantial flaw but is otherwise acceptable. <b>6pts</b>	Discussion has multiple flaws in logic. <b>4pts</b>	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. <b>0pts</b>
<b>Reproducibility</b>	All required files are provided. Rmd file knits without issues and reproduces pdf. <b>10pts</b>	All required files except pdf are provided. Rmd file knits without issues and produces a pdf. <b>8pts</b>	Rmd requires minor modification to knit without issues, or key datafile is missing. <b>6pts</b>	Rmd requires major modification to knit without issues, or is not provided. <b>4pts</b>	Not attempted. <b>0pts</b>
<b>Presentation</b>	Entire document is well structured and easy to follow. No extraneous materials. <b>10pts</b>	Document is mostly well structured, but some aspects are confusing or difficult to follow. <b>8pts</b>	Document has several deficiencies, such as excessive extraneous materials, misplaced figures, code, or text, or is otherwise confusing. <b>6pts</b>	Document is near impossible to comprehend. <b>4pts</b>	Incomprehensible/not attempted. <b>0pts</b>
<b>Points total:</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>