|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Ideal** | **Satisfactory** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Name and Title** | Name. title, class, and date are correctly formatted and summarize the paper. | Everything is present, but not formatted correctly. | Missing the student’s name, title, name of the class, or date. |
| **Introduction** | Fully explains the context of the issue and the motivating reasons for selection. | Present but lacks details on reason for choice. | Missing or fails to establish context. |
| **Data Provenance** | Original paper summarized and all details of who, when and how the data was collected. | Identifies original source but is missing some critical detail. | Missing or refers to CSV website instead of actual origin. |
| **Graph** | Fully labeled graph with clear interpretation. | Appropriate choice, but missing label or caption. | Missing or incorrect choice of graph for the data. |
| **Aesthetics and Geometry** | Everything is explained and relevant to the paper topic. | Axis, graph type, and reasons by graph type choice are mostly explained. | One or more explanations are missing or failed to relate to the issue. |
| **Argument** | Argument is strongly supported by the graph and leads to the ultimate recommendation. | An argument is made, but weakly related to the graph. | No clear argument present, or the argument does not relate to the graph. |
| **Conclusion** | Fully describes what was accomplished and what was not, with insights to future work. | Identifies limitations or extensions of the analysis but fails to talk about both. | Fails to identify limitations or potential extensions of the argument. |
| **References** | References provided for both the context and original data source with consistent formatting. | All references are identified (from both the introduction and data provenance) but minor formatting errors. | References are missing or incomprehensible. |
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