

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
Component scores. (Both Part 1 and Part 2 will each be scored by these criteria. Point values apply per part.)					
Justification of approach	The chosen programming approach is clearly explained and justified. 5pts	Justification of approach has minor flaws, e.g. is too short or too long. 4pts	Justification of approach has one major flaw, e.g. an important part of the code is not explained or explained incorrectly. 3pts	Justification of approach has multiple major flaws. 2pts	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. 0pts
Code correctness	Code is correct, easy to read, properly formatted, and properly documented. 10pts	Code is correct but has minor problems with formatting or documentation (e.g., lacks comments). 9pts	Code has minor flaws (e.g., some analysis steps are not coded correctly), or is difficult to follow, or includes extraneous parts. 8pts	Code has multiple major flaws. 6pts	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. 0pts
Code complexity	All required code elements (for loop, if statement, etc) are present and used appropriately. 10pts	One required code element is used somewhat awkwardly. 8pts	One required code element is missing, or is included in a roundabout or nonsensical manner. 6pts	Two or more required code elements are missing or are included in a roundabout or nonsensical manner. 4pts	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. 0pts
Discussion of results	Discussion of results is clear and correct, and it has some depth (e.g., presents speculation or a hypothesis derived from the results) without being excessively long. 10pts	Discussion of results is mostly clear and correct, but has minor inaccuracies or lacks some depth. 8pts	Discussion has one substantial flaw (i.e., a major conceptual error) but is otherwise acceptable. 6pts	Discussion has multiple flaws in logic or conceptual inaccuracies. 4pts	Entirely incorrect/not attempted. 0pts
Document-wide scores. (These criteria will be applied once to the entire document.)					
Reproducibility	All required files are provided. Jupyter Notebook file runs without issues and reproduces the submitted pdf. 10pts	All required files except pdf are provided. Jupyter Notebook file runs without issues. 9pts	Jupyter Notebook requires minor modification to run without issues, or key datafile is missing. 8pts	Jupyter Notebook requires major modification to run without issues. 6pts	Jupyter Notebook is not provided. 0pts
Presentation	Entire document is well structured and easy to follow. No extraneous materials. 10pts	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. 0pts
Question, Part 2	Question is interesting and appropriate for the chosen dataset. 10pts	Question is appropriate for the dataset but lacks depth or insight. 9pts	Question is either overly technical or vague. 8pts	Question is not a question or does not relate to the given dataset. 5pts	Not attempted. 0pts
Points total:	100	85	70	49	0

(Points total counts all component scores twice, once for each part.)