Project 3 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.

	Exceeds expectations	Meets expectations	Needs improvement	Unsatisfactory	Failing
Introduction	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. 10pts	Introduction has minor flaws, e.g. is too short or too long. 8pts	Introduction has one major flaw, such as not describing the relevant variables in the dataset. 6pts	Introduction has multiple major flaws. 4pts	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. Opts
Justification of approach	The chosen analysis approach and visualizations are clearly explained and justified. 10pts	Justification of approach has minor flaws, e.g. is too short or too long. 8pts			Entirely incorrect/not attempted. Opts
Question	•	Question is conceptual and appropriate for the dataset but lacks depth or insight. 8pts	Question is either overly technical or vague, or prompts one particular analysis. 6pts	Question is not a question or does not relate to the given dataset. 4pts	Not attempted, or, using an invalid dataset (outside the specified date boundaries). Opts
Code	read, properly	Code is correct but has minor problems with formatting or documentation. 8pts	Code has minor flaws, is missing data wrangling component, or includes extraneous parts. 6pts	Code has major flaws. 4pts	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. Opts
Analysis	Analysis approach is appropriate for the given question and dataset. 15pts	Analysis approach is mostly appropriate but has some minor issues. 12pts	Analysis approach has one major problem. 9pts	Analysis approach has multiple problems. 6pts	Entirely incorrect/not attempted, or, required analysis components as listed in the instructions (PCA, clustering, etc.) are not included. Opts
Visualization	The visualizations are appropriate, easy to read, properly labeled, and nicely styled. 15pts	The visualizations have minor flaws, such as with legibility or labeling, or the chosen geom is suboptimal, or there are minor problems with styling. 12pts	The visualizations have substantial flaws with legibility or labeling, or are confusing, or have not been styled. 9pts	The visualizations have major flaws, i.e., are barely comprehensible or entirely inappropriate. 6pts	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. Opts
Discussion of results	•	Discussion of results is mostly clear and correct, but has minor inaccuracies or lacks some depth. 8pts	Discussion has one substantial flaw but is otherwise acceptable. 6pts	Discussion has multiple flaws in logic. 4pts	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. Opts
Reproducibility	All required files are provided. Rmd file knits without issues and reproduces pdf. 10pts	All required files except pdf are provided. Rmd file knits without issues and produces a pdf. 8pts	Rmd requires minor modification to knit without issues, or key datafile is missing. 6pts	Rmd requires major modification to knit without issues, or is not provided. 4pts	Not attempted, or, using an invalid dataset (outside the specified date boundaries). Opts
Presentation	structured and easy to follow. No extraneous	Document is mostly well structured, but some aspects are confusing or difficult to follow. 8pts	Document has several deficiencies, such as excessive extraneous materials, misplaced figures, code, or text, or is otherwise confusing. 6pts	Document is near impossible to comprehend. 4pts	Incomprehensible/not attempted. Opts
Points total:	100	80	60	40	C