

Math 216 Application Project

Student Names: \_\_\_\_\_

Component	Poor (1 point)	Acceptable (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Excellent (4 points)	Score
<i>Content</i>					
Questions	There's no central question addressed in the project.	There's a central question addressed in the project, but not explicitly.	There's a central question explicitly addressed in the project.	More than one interesting question is addressed explicitly in the project.	
Methods <b>(Double points for this row!)</b>	The methods used to model the problem and answer the question(s) posed are entirely inappropriate.	The methods used have potential to model the problem and answer the question(s) posed, but are applied in inappropriate ways.	The methods used to model the problem and answer the question(s) posed are (for the most part) appropriately applied.	The methods used to model the problem and answer the question(s) posed are not only appropriate, but show signs of creativity.	
Assumptions	Assumptions (about normality, about the relationship between the sample and the population) are not stated in the project.	Assumptions are stated in the project, although the assumptions are inappropriate or poorly explained.	At least one appropriate and clearly explained assumption is stated in the project.	All appropriate assumptions are clearly explained in the paper.	
Computations	Several obvious computational mistakes	A few obvious computational mistakes	At most, only a couple of obvious computational mistakes	No obvious computational mistakes.	
Answers	Answers to questions raised in the project are provided in the context of the problem without clear connections to the mathematical models used.	Answers to questions raised in the project are provided based on the mathematical models used, but not in the context of the problem itself.	Questions raised in the project are answered in the context of the chosen problem with a connection made to the math models used, but the connection is fuzzy.	All questions raised in the project are clearly answered in the context of the chosen problem.	

Component	Poor (1 point)	Acceptable (2 points)	Good (3 points)	Excellent (4 points)	Score
<i>Communication</i>					
Organization	There's no obvious structure to the infographic.	There's some structure to the infographic, but it's sloppy or hard to follow.	Infographic is structured well (using headings, arrangement, and whitespace), but there's no conceptual basis for the organizational scheme.	Infographic is structured and spaced well, with a clear conceptual basis for the organizational scheme.	
Spatial Relationships	Spatial relationships (axes, areas, etc.) in the infographic obscure, not convey, meaning.	Some spatial relationships convey meaning, but many have no particular meaning.	Spatial relationships are generally used to convey meaning, with some exceptions.	Spatial relationships are used to convey meaning and show signs of creativity.	
Colors	Colors are chosen arbitrarily or seemingly without reason.	Colors neither distract nor aid in the communication of information.	Colors are used to convey meaning or otherwise enhance communication.	Colors are used to convey meaning and are aesthetically appealing.	
Text	Text is used in the infographic in confusing or arbitrary ways.	Some useful explanatory text is provided, but not much.	Infographic text is used to explain the context of the problem and clarify purposes of visualizations.	Text and visuals work together so that each is enhanced by the other.	
Sources	There's no attempt to explain sources of data or of ideas drawn from outside the course.	Some attempt at sourcing is made, but sources are unclear or ambiguous.	Sources are clearly provided, but it's unclear how they were used.	Sources of data and of ideas drawn from outside the course are clearly provided, as are the ways they were used.	
Aesthetics	Hurts the eyes.	Dull and uninteresting.	Pleasant enough.	Attractive, with notably creative elements.	