

# CS 7295 project final grading rubric

Team:

Partner:

Data:

Project element	Ratings		
	Exceeds (Grade of A)	Meets (Grade of B)	Does not meet (Grade <= C)
<b>Problem and partner statement (4%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Clear focus, and an extremely comprehensive explanation of the problem, the connection to applied and basic research, and proposes a purposeful and reasonable response.</li> <li>* The introduction is engaging, states the problem, provides a context for the study and previews the project's structure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* There is a clear focus, and a developed explanation of the problem, a connection to applied and basic research has been made and a reasonable response is proposed.</li> <li>* The introduction states the problem, provides a context for the study and previews the structure of the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* There is no clear focus for the project. No case has been made that a problem exists. No connection to applied or basic research is evident. An under-developed response is proposed.</li> <li>* No clear intro., problem statement, or structure</li> </ul>
<b>Action Plan (12%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Action plan outlined was carried out completely.</li> <li>* Any modifications made to the action plan were done to make the project successful in the context of the course and were clearly grounded in research and sound judgment.</li> <li>* High degree of critical thinking</li> <li>* Good original thought and support.</li> <li>* The innovation is directly linked to a partner problem and is grounded in research.</li> <li>* Resource needs and potential challenges were addressed as needed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Action plan outlined was mostly carried out (60% or more).</li> <li>* Any modifications made to the action plan were done to make the project successful in the context of the course and demonstrate reasonable judgment.</li> <li>* Some critical thinking evident.</li> <li>* Some original thought and support.</li> <li>* The innovation is linked to a partner problem and tentatively supported in research.</li> <li>* Some resource needs and potential challenges were not addressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Action plan outlined was not completed.</li> <li>* Significant modifications were made to the action plan without consulting instructors.</li> <li>* Action steps are not outlined in light of relevant research &amp; best practice. Action steps have been missed.</li> <li>* Little to no critical thought evident.</li> <li>* Ideas are vague or unoriginal.</li> <li>* The innovation might be linked to a partner problem but the connection is not clear in research.</li> <li>* Resource needs and potential challenges stopped the project from moving forward.</li> </ul>

Project element	Ratings		
	Exceeds (Grade of A)	Meets (Grade of B)	Does not meet (Grade <= C)
<b>Literature review (6%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Comprehensive review of the current, relevant literature to both the problem statement and the proposed innovation is presented.</li> <li>* 10 or more references are primarily peer- reviewed professional journals or other approved sources (e.g. gov't. documents). Reader is confident and trusts the information.</li> <li>* Each source is explained with one or more sentences.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Study is connected to the existing research, and use of mostly relevant and recent literature related to the problem statement and proposed innovation.</li> <li>* Although most of the 10 or more references are professionally legitimate, a few are questionable. The reader is uncertain of the reliability of some sources.</li> <li>* Each source is explained with one or more sentences.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Little or no attempt to connect the study to existing research.</li> <li>* There are virtually no sources that are professionally reliable. The reader seriously doubts the value of the material and stops reading.</li> <li>* There is no description of the relevance of each source.</li> <li>* There are fewer than 10 references.</li> </ul>
<b>Data and tools (8%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Data sources match the problem statement and project innovation.</li> <li>* Data is thoroughly explored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Data sources match the problem statement and project innovation.</li> <li>* There is some exploration of the data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Data sources do not match the problem statement or innovation.</li> <li>* There is little to no exploration of the data.</li> </ul>
<b>Design (20%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* A mature visual and interaction design is presented, with evidence for iterative improvement.</li> <li>* Effective use of basic visual encodings: spatial layout, color, size, shape...</li> <li>* Multiple views use consistent visual encodings.</li> <li>* The design is aesthetically pleasing and clear.</li> <li>* Representation of data is bold and original.</li> <li>* Visualizations provide a fair representation of the underlying data.</li> <li>* Data presented is compelling and conveys useful information.</li> <li>* Visualizations convincingly support partner problems.</li> <li>* Appropriate legends and explanatory text are provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* A decent visual and interaction design is presented, with evidence for iterative improvement.</li> <li>* Decent use of basic visual encodings: spatial layout, color, size, shape...</li> <li>* Multiple views use relatively consistent visual encodings.</li> <li>* The design is reasonably pleasing and clear.</li> <li>* Representation of data is thoughtful or a combination of useful exiting techniques.</li> <li>* Visualizations provide a fair representation of the underlying data.</li> <li>* Data presented is appropriate and conveys useful information.</li> <li>* Visualizations are designed with the partner problems in mind.</li> <li>* Appropriate legends and explanatory text are provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* A mediocre or poor visual and interaction design is presented with no evidence for iterative improvement.</li> <li>* Visual encodings seem chosen arbitrarily or without reason.</li> <li>* Multiple views have dramatically inconsistent visual encodings.</li> <li>* The design is jumbled or confusing, dull or uninteresting.</li> <li>* Representation of data is dull and uninteresting.</li> <li>* Visualizations are misleading.</li> <li>* Data presented is superfluous, unnecessary, redundant</li> <li>* Visualizations do not adequately address the partner problems.</li> <li>* No legends or explanatory text is provided.</li> </ul>

Project element	Ratings		
	Exceeds (Grade of A)	Meets (Grade of B)	Does not meet (Grade <= C)
<b>Evaluation (8%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Evaluation goals and methods are well thought out and appropriate.</li> <li>* Data analysis and statistics are appropriately applied.</li> <li>* Results convincingly address the goals.</li> <li>* The goals, methods, analysis, and results are comprehensively described.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Evaluation goals and methods are well thought out and appropriate.</li> <li>* Data analysis and statistics are appropriately applied.</li> <li>* Results are promising and in line with addressing the goals with more work.</li> <li>* The goals, methods, analysis, and results are described, though lack specifics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Evaluation goals and methods are not appropriate or not developed fully.</li> <li>* Analysis and statistics is overly simplistic or misleading.</li> <li>* Results are incomplete or not in line with addressing the goals.</li> <li>* There is insufficient description and detail of goals, methods, analysis, and results.</li> </ul>
<b>Video (8%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Video is 3-5 minutes and the time is well utilized.</li> <li>* Annotations, transitions, and narration clearly explain what is on the screen.</li> <li>* The video demonstration improves understanding of the project beyond what is presented in the paper.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Video is 2-6 minutes and the time is well utilized.</li> <li>* Annotations, transitions, and narration are used but need more clarity.</li> <li>* The video demonstration reiterates material presented in the paper.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Video is under 2 minutes, over 6 minutes, or the time is poorly utilized.</li> <li>* Annotations, transitions, and narration are not used or used ineffectively.</li> <li>* The video demonstration does not convey information about the project clearly.</li> </ul>
<b>Online Demo (8%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* A running online demo is provided that effectively demonstrates the data and design elements of the project.</li> <li>* There are few to no usability issues when accessed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* A buildable from source demo is provided that is documented well enough to easily deploy.</li> <li>* The demo demonstrates the data and design elements of the project, but incompletely.</li> <li>* There are usability issues that make using the demo difficult.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* A demo is not running online and is not buildable or too poorly documented to build.</li> <li>* The demo doesn't demonstrate the project data and design elements.</li> <li>* There are critical usability issues that prevent usage, even when using any of Firefox, Chrome, and Edge.</li> </ul>
<b>Clear organization (8%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Writing shows high degree of attention to logic and reasoning of points. Unity clearly leads the reader to the conclusion and stirs thought regarding the topic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Writing is coherent and logically organized. Some points remain misplaced and stray from the topic. Transitions evident but not used throughout text.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Writing lacks logical organization. It shows some coherence but ideas lack unity. Serious errors.</li> </ul>
<b>Concise and clear writing (10%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The text is 8 pages double column in standard format.</li> <li>* The amount of content is appropriate for the amount of text.</li> <li>* The text was clearly written.</li> <li>* Words were chosen that precisely expressed the intended meaning and supported reader comprehension.</li> <li>* Sentences were grammatical and free from errors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The text is 8 pages double column in standard format.</li> <li>* There is more text than necessary for the presented content.</li> <li>* The text was clearly written for the most part.</li> <li>* Words were well chosen with some minor exceptions.</li> <li>* Sentences were mostly grammatical and/or only a few spelling errors were present but they did not hinder the reader.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The text is 4 pages double column in standard format or in any other format.</li> <li>* There is little content and overly verbose text.</li> <li>* The reader had to make considerable effort to understand the underlying logic and flow of ideas.</li> <li>* Grammatical and spelling errors made it difficult for the reader to interpret the text in places.</li> </ul>

Project element	Ratings		
	Exceeds (Grade of A)	Meets (Grade of B)	Does not meet (Grade <= C)
<b>Readable figures (4%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Figures enhanced and clarified presentation of ideas.</li> <li>* No issues with pixelation, color, layout of figures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Figures were consistent with the text.</li> <li>* No major issues with pixelation, color, layout.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Figures were absent or inconsistent with the text.</li> <li>* Serious issues of color, pixelation present.</li> </ul>
<b>Slides (2%)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Complete, self-enclosed slides from the final presentation are provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Complete slides from the final presentation are provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Slides are incomplete or not easily displayable.</li> </ul>
<b>Who did what (2%)</b>	The team worked well together to achieve objectives. Each member contributed in a valuable way to the project. All data sources indicated a high level of mutual respect and collaboration	The team worked well together most of the time, with only a few occurrences of communication breakdown or failure to collaborate when appropriate. Members were mostly respectful of each other.	Team did not collaborate or communicate well. Some members would work independently, without regard to objectives or priorities. A lack of respect and regard was frequently noted.