MC 501 White Paper and conference poster rubric

200 points. Due Friday, December 18, 11:59 PM.

How this is scored. Add the points from each row; the total is out of 200. A first attempt is graded forgivingly: a part that is there but incomplete earns partial credit, and 0 is kept for a part that is missing. Length: the paper 5,000 to 7,000 words from the introduction through the reflection, plus the 150 to 250 word abstract; the poster one page of 400 to 800 words. Word counts cover your own writing, not the title, headings, tables, references, figure captions, code, or output, and writing more than the range never costs points. Scores on work that shows effort are adjusted with the course's curve: your final percentage is 25 percent plus 75 percent of your rubric percentage, so 50 of 100 on the rubric becomes 62.5. Work at two-thirds or more of the minimum length counts as showing effort. Attempts are unlimited, so you can revise an early submission right up to the deadline.

- Dated step, Monday, December 7: push your full coded dataset to your project repository. Your Methods reports stability from your pilot re-code; there is no second re-code. Nothing about your analysis is due that day.
- The poster carries the study at a glance: the question, the method, one figure that does real work, the finding with its effect size, and the limitation. It is read standing up from three feet away, so it is not the paper shrunk.
- Submit one ZIP file holding the paper PDF, the poster PDF, and your AI-use log, plus the live GitHub Pages URL pasted into the submission; the submission is incomplete without each. The poster is graded as a separate requirement shared with MC 500 (Phase V page), so this grid scores the paper. The row weights are the same as the White Paper rubric on the Phase V page.

White Paper and conference poster, 200 points

Criterion	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Beginning
Introduction and framing 25 points	**25 points.** States the question, why it matters now, and the gap, situated in the theoretical literature: your lens, one rival lens, and research questions or hypotheses each traceable to the theory section.	**19 to 24 points.** Clear question and lens, but the rival lens is missing or a question cannot be traced to the theory.	**13 to 18 points.** The literature is gestured at instead of used.	**0 to 12 points.** No clear question.

Criterion	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Beginning
Methods 55 points	**55 points.** Repeatable in detail (unit of analysis, population and frame, sampling method, corpus size with its justification) and carries the three transparency markers: data provenance (source, date range, what was excluded and why); the reliability report (the statistic, its value from your pilot re-code, the procedure, the threshold, and the single-coder limitation named as such); and the pre-registration disclosure: the dated pre-registration file in your project repository, cited by path and commit, and every departure from it.	**41 to 54 points.** Repeatable, with all three markers, but one is thin, most often the account of departures from the plan.	**28 to 40 points.** One transparency marker is missing (Methods cannot reach full credit without all three), or the design is too loose to repeat.	**0 to 27 points.** Two or more markers missing.

Criterion	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Beginning
Results 40 points	**40 points.** Without interpretation: descriptive statistics for every coded variable; one inferential test per research question, each with its effect size, confidence interval and power statistics; one robustness or alternative-specification check; at least two figures and one table, numbered, captioned, given alt text, and referred to by number.	**30 to 39 points.** All there, but one element is thin: a missing confidence interval, a figure never referred to, or interpretation creeping in.	**20 to 29 points.** The effect sizes or the robustness check are missing.	**0 to 19 points.** Results are missing, or described in words without the numbers.
Discussion 40 points	**40 points.** Interprets the findings within the theoretical literature, separates statistical significance from practical size, and states the limits, including the single-coder design and the second-coder counterfactual.	**30 to 39 points.** Interprets and states limits, but the counterfactual or the significance-versus-size point is thin.	**20 to 29 points.** Restates the results without interpreting them, or inflates a small effect.	**0 to 19 points.** Missing.

Criterion	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Beginning
Abstract and references 15 points	**15 points.** An abstract of 150 to 250 words carrying the question, method, finding and implication; at least fifteen sources, at least ten of them peer-reviewed articles reporting original research; one citation and reporting style, used consistently throughout (APA 7 is one option), with claim-first citations, and the list and in-text citations matching both ways.	**11 to 14 points.** One gap: the abstract skips a part, or the list and the in-text citations disagree in a few places.	**8 to 10 points.** Fewer than fifteen sources or fewer than ten peer-reviewed articles, or an abstract under 150 words, which usually means the finding or its implication is missing.	**0 to 7 points.** No abstract or no reference list.
Reproducibility and publication 15 points	**15 points.** Renders from source with no errors, every number, figure and table comes from the code, and it is live at a public address.	**11 to 14 points.** Renders and is live, but one number is typed in instead of produced by the code.	**8 to 10 points.** Several numbers or a figure pasted in.	**0 to 7 points.** Does not render from source.
Reflection 10 points	**10 points.** One specific paragraph naming what proved harder than expected, what the data could not answer, and what a second attempt would change.	**8 to 9 points.** Specific, but skips one of the three.	**5 to 7 points.** General ("I learned a lot").	**0 to 4 points.** Missing.