

CS458 Spring 2021: Blog post grading rubric

Your blog post will be graded on the content, presentation and discussion. The rubric below includes the points (in **bold**) for each of the content, presentation and discussion sub-criteria for the blog post grade (16 points = 1 mark). Total marks for this task will be the sum of the points for the blog post and your comments, divided by 16 points per mark and rounded up to the nearest 0.5 marks.

	Marks	Excellent (56 points = 3.5 marks)	Satisfactory (40 points = 2.5 marks)	Poor (16 points = 1 mark)
CONTENT [1.5 / 3.5]	0.25	The blog post has a clear introduction, middle section, and conclusion. The writing has a logical flow between the three sections. 4	The blog post has a clear introduction, middle section, and conclusion. The post may be missing logical flow between the introduction and the middle section or the middle section and conclusion. 3	The blog post does not have a clear introduction, middle section and conclusion, with significant issues in structuring the logical flow of the post. 1
	0.25	The introduction motivates the main issue well and outlines who will be impacted and how. 4	The introduction presents some motivation or impact of the issue/topic. 3	The introduction is abrupt and some terms are used without being introduced in context. 1
	0.25	The conclusion discusses mitigations and preventions clearly. 4	The conclusion wraps up the topic and presents one of: mitigations, preventions or general consequences. 3	There is no or an abrupt conclusion, with no discussion of consequences or mitigations or preventions. 1
	0.75	Causes are described clearly with excellent technical details or examples in the middle section and contain few or no inaccuracies. 12	Causes are described; some technical details or examples are unclear and contain some inaccuracies. 8	The causes of the issue are not described well: most technical details or examples are unclear and contain significant inaccuracies. 4

PRESENTATION [1.25 / 3.5]	0.25	The title is grammatically correct and reflects the content of the blogpost. 4	The title is grammatically correct and reflects the content of the blogpost. 4	The title is misleading and/or grammatically incorrect. 1
	0.5	The blogpost is consistently well formatted and has little to no spelling or grammatical errors. 8	Parts of the blogpost are well formatted, but the formatting is inconsistent, or, the blogpost has few grammatical and spelling errors. 6	The blogpost is not well formatted (e.g., some parts are difficult to read due to small fonts) and contains many errors that detract from the meaning. 4
	0.5	Citation criteria [C1, C2, C3] are followed throughout. All fields are included in almost all citations as per criteria C4. If abbreviations are used, criteria A1 is met consistently. 8	Two out of the three citation criteria [C1, C2, C3] are followed throughout. At least one field is missing in almost all citations as per criteria C4. If abbreviations are used, full-forms are provided for some but not all of the articles. 6	At most one out of the three citation criteria [C1, C2, C3] is met throughout. If abbreviations are used, criteria A1 is not met, i.e. full-forms are not used at all. 4
DISCUSSION [0.75 / 3.5]	0.25	The conclusion includes multiple thought-provoking questions to initiate a discussion. 4	The conclusion includes at least one thought-provoking question. 3	The conclusion includes a simplistic question (“What do you think?”) or no questions at all. 0
	0.5	The author responds to multiple readers’ comments and engages extensively with at least 1 of the comments. 8	The author responds to some of the readers’ comments. 4	The author does not respond to the readers’ comments. 0

If your blog post doesn't have any comments, then you will get full marks for the last row. See the next page for citation, abbreviation criteria.

Comment grading rubric

You should post at least four comments in response to four different blog posts in four different weeks. The points for the best of four comments will be summed up to form your comment points (maximum $6 * 4 = 24 = 16$ points per mark * 1.5 marks).

Excellent	Satisfactory	Poor
<p>The reader read further on the topic and introduced new aspects to the conversation, backed up by citations and/or references to concepts discussed in course material.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">6</p>	<p>The reader engaged with the topic and addressed the discussion question(s) using consistent reasoning (not just personal preference). They may have applied concepts discussed in class.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<p>The comment was not substantial (see below) or unique.</p> <p>The reader relied on personal anecdotes or expressed personal preferences, without consistent reasoning.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p>

Citation guide/criteria:

- [C1] The content should be backed up by citations as it is discussed.
- [C2] Citations should be made in numerical order throughout the blog post, as shown below.
- [C3] Numbered citations should be presented at the end of the article.
- [C4] All citations should be presented in the ACM citation style: <https://www.acm.org/publications/authors/reference-formatting>

Abbreviations guide: You do not have to mention the initialism or abbreviation if you only use the long form once or twice throughout your blog post. If you do use the abbreviated form *at all*, then make sure that:

- [A1] The full forms of all abbreviations are presented the first time it is mentioned in the text.

Example text: Bayesian statistics [1] underlies many machine learning models. The Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF) has explored many privacy-invasive applications of machine learning models. These models are susceptible to many attacks, such as the membership inference attack ... These attacks are very relevant as machine learning models make decisions that affect peoples' lives, including sentencing [2].....

[1] Harry Thornburg. 2001. Introduction to Bayesian Statistics. Retrieved March 2, 2005 from <http://ccrma.stanford.edu/~jos/bayes/bayes.html>

[2] Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu and Lauren Kirchner. 2016. Machine Bias. Retrieved April 25, 2021 from <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing>

General format for website citations: Authors. Year of publishing or last update. Title. Retrieved Month Day, 2021 from <url>

Insubstantial comments: This post is really good! Me too, I agree with this! I found a spelling error here!