



Name student:

Master's Programme: Applied Data Science Post Graduate

Student number:

Research group:

# Rubric Writing Assignment

Criteria	Insufficient: fails to meet academic requirements	Satisfactory: meets academic requirements	Excellent: belongs to the top 10%*
<b>Content</b>	Content: Insufficient	Content: Satisfactory	Content: Excellent
<b>Title</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not justify the content</li> <li>Suggests incorrect/over interpretation of data</li> </ul>	Represents the content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attracts attention</li> <li>Creative and original</li> </ul>
<b>Abstract</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Misrepresents the content</li> <li>Lacks components</li> <li>Is hard to understand</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Represents most highlights</li> <li>Contains all components</li> <li>Can be understood without additional information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Represents main information and all highlights</li> <li>Concise and correct</li> </ul>
<b>Layman's Summary</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Misrepresents the content</li> <li>Unattractive and too technical</li> <li>Level too high / too low</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Represents most highlights</li> <li>Understandable but not appealing</li> <li>High school level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Represents main information and all highlights</li> <li>Interesting to read and easy to understand</li> </ul>
<b>Introduction</b> <i>Relevance research question and scope of literature research (if applicable)</i>	<p>Incomplete or inaccurate overview of literature</p> <p>Research question absent or lacks focus</p> <p>Relevance research question unclear</p> <p>Search strategy is badly motivated, inappropriate, confusing or unsystematic</p>	<p>Adequate overview of relevant literature</p> <p>Research question well defined and focussed</p> <p>Relevance of research question clarified</p> <p>Valid strategy used for searching literature or collecting data</p>	<p>Complete concise overview of relevant literature</p> <p>Substantiated research question with clear focus</p> <p>Research question has the potential to contribute useful new knowledge to the field</p> <p>Search strategy clearly outlined and optimally suited to answer research question</p>
<b>Main body of text</b> <i>Description of relevant literature/ data analysis</i>	<p>Incomplete or incorrect analysis of relevant literature/data</p> <p>Data/retrieved publications are irrelevant</p>	<p>Satisfactory analyses/ descriptions/ interpretations of data/retrieved literature</p> <p>Text can be understood without information provided by figures and tables</p>	<p>Data/retrieved publications and analyses are valid, complete and presented concisely</p> <p>Interpretation of literature/data is convincing and creative</p>
<b>Tables and figures</b>	<p>Absent/incorrect referral in written text</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tables and figures are irrelevant</li> <li>Do not support text</li> </ul> <p>Legends provide insufficient information</p>	<p>Correctly referred to in written text</p> <p>Relevant presentation of acquired data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can be understood without additional information</li> <li>Legends contain the necessary information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presented in the best possible way</li> <li>Excellent presentation of acquired data</li> </ul> <p>Legends are complete and concise</p>
<b>Discussion and Conclusion</b> <i>Presentation of new models or hypotheses, Depth and critical analysis</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weak or not supported by evidence</li> <li>Repetitive information</li> </ul> <p>Fails to answer research question</p> <p>Data inadequately discussed, striking similarity to</p>	<p>In line with presented evidence</p> <p>Answers research question</p> <p>Relation data and research question discussed</p>	<p>Concise, complete and in depth discussion of</p>

	Data inadequately discussed, sticking rigidly to existing concepts or using invalid arguments	Relation data and research question discussed adequately, using valid arguments	Concise, sensitive and in depth discussion of data in relation to research question
	Discussion fails to address strengths and weaknesses of study	Strengths and limitations, new insights are addressed in the light of the literature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complete, critical and balanced discussion of strengths, limitations, new insights and hypotheses</li> <li>Critical discussion of how the data relate to current knowledge of the subject</li> </ul>
	Hypotheses, new models, or suggestions for additional research are missing/ illogical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestions for future research may be based on weak assumptions</li> <li>New insights, hypotheses or new models presented</li> </ul>	New insights, new models and hypotheses are discussed in depth
<b>Structure and Style</b>	<b>Structure and Style: Insufficient</b>	<b>Structure and Style: Satisfactory</b>	<b>Structure and Style: Excellent</b>
Structure and line of reasoning	The line of thought is unclear	Line of thought mostly clear	The line of thought is easy to follow and supported by the structure
	Text is badly structured	Structure supports legibility of text	
Referencing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Referral is insufficient, inconsistent, incomplete or incorrect</li> <li>References cannot be retrieved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Referral is complete and correct</li> <li>References can be traced</li> <li>Correct application of a single referencing system</li> </ul>	(Key) references have been found independently
Writing Skills	Style too wordy or too concise	Grammar and style enable understanding of the information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Writing flows smoothly</li> <li>Grammar and style support legibility of the document</li> </ul>
	Disturbing spelling or grammar mistakes	No errors present detected by spellcheckers	
<b>Professional attitude</b>	<b>Professional attitude: Insufficient</b>	<b>Professional attitude: Satisfactory</b>	<b>Professional attitude: Excellent</b>
Initiative, independence, creativity	Content superficially handled; depth is lacking	Part of ideas/content conceived independently	Content is provided independently
	Relies on supervisor's instructions only	Takes initiative (initially) after stimulation	Contains creative elements
Critical attitude	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical attitude is absent</li> <li>Self-reflection is absent</li> </ul>	Shows self-reflection and has critical attitude towards (published) research	Critical attitude is based on intellectual depth and profundity
Integrity, Conscientiousness	Data manipulated or left out**	Accurate, reliable and trustworthy	
Timeliness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fails to meet deadlines</li> <li>Fails to keep appointments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meets most deadlines</li> <li>Keeps appointments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sets own deadlines and adheres to them</li> <li>Schedules appointments when necessary</li> </ul>

Name Supervisor: