

Grading Rubric for Project Paper

- Overall Structure and Format(5%)
 - **4:** The paper is the correct length, has appropriately documented sections, and uses a consistent format for references, figures and tables.
 - **3:** The paper is the correct length, but has some formatting inconsistencies.
 - **2:** The paper is not the correct length or it has very inconsistent formatting
 - **1:** The paper is not the correct length and it has very inconsistent formatting
- Abstract (10%)
 - **4:** The abstract is clearly written and answers all three fundamental questions (Why did you do what you did? What did you do? What did you find?)
 - **3:** The abstract is written sufficiently clearly that one can reasonably infer the answers to all three of the above questions.
 - **2:** The abstract is insufficiently clear to be understood in isolation and does not answer all of the above questions.
 - **1:** The abstract fails to provide a clear picture of what the paper is about.
- Introduction (10%)
 - **4:** The introduction clearly lays out the subject and organization of the paper, why it is interesting and how it relates to prior work.
 - **3:** The introduction adequately describes the subject and organization of the paper, why it is interesting and how it relates to prior work.
 - **2:** The introduction does not clearly articulate why the subject of this work is interesting and/or how it relates to prior work.
 - **1:** The introduction does not explain why the subject of this work is interesting and/or how it relates to prior work.
- Theoretical Background (25%)
 - **4:** The background section explains the theory behind the topic of interest clearly and provides appropriate references that supply additional detail.
 - **3:** The background section explains the theory behind the topic of interest with some noticeable but minor gaps in the logic of the presentation. (e.g. not explaining why one equation can be transformed into another)
 - **2:** The background section explains the theory behind the topic of interest, but there are critical gaps in the logic or presentation. (e.g. not explaining the conditions under which any of the equations are valid)
 - **1:** The background section does not provide information that can be easily related to the rest of the paper.
- Methods (25%)
 - **4:** The methods provides sufficient information for the reader to independently reproduce the results of this work.
 - **3:** There are some things missing from the methods section, but the reader can independently reproduce the main results of this work with the information provided.
 - **2:** The methods provide a general sense of what the author did, but a reader attempting to reproduce the paper's results cannot do so in detail based on the information in the paper.
 - **1:** The methods section does not provide enough information for the reader to have even a general sense of what the author did.
- Results and Discussion (25%)
 - **4:** The results of the analysis and their relationship to prior work are clearly presented.
 - **3:** The results of the analysis are mostly clear, and the connection to prior work is mentioned
 - **2:** Some of the results are unclear, or they are not clearly tied to prior work.
 - **1:** The results of the analysis are unclear and are not tied back to prior work.