|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Component | Excellent (4 pts) | Very Good (3) | Good (2) | Needs Work (1) | Missing (0) |
| Results | (Questions 2, 3) Clearly states which forest type has higher diversity for each metric (). | Has results, possibly unclear or only half correct. | Has results, possibly missing some/ incomplete. | Has results, but they are confusing and incomplete/incorrect. | No results. |
| Code interpretation | (Questions 3, 4) Clearly and correctly interprets what the second index is measuring () and what the code is doing to correct of difference in area for the different forest types (). | Code interpretation is mostly correct. | Code interpretation is partially correct. | Code interpretation is mostly incorrect. | No interpretation. |
| Figure | (Question 4) Includes figure, with appropriate colors, axes, and error bars. | Includes figure, but missing one of axes or error bars or appropriate colors. | Includes figure, but missing two of axes or error bars or appropriate colors. | Includes figure, but missing no axes, error bars, or appropriate colors. | No figure. |
| Caption | (Question 5) Caption is clear, concise, and includes all information needed to interpret the figure. | Caption is clear, but possibly missing some information. | Caption is unclear, and possibly missing some information. | Caption is missing a lot of necessary information. | No caption. |
| Discussion | (Question 5) Discussion is clearly written, references the figure/results, and brings up a major discussion point (eg why it matters that forest types differ in diversity, why it matters what diversity index we use) | Discussion is somewhat unclear or is missing a reference to the results. | Discussion doesn’t bring up a major discussion point. | Discussion is mostly unclear and doesn’t bring up a major discussion point. | No discussion. |