Grading rubric for the final paper

Mathematical correctness (5)

5 The math and its motivations are correct, sufficiently rigorous, and demonstrate a solid understanding of the material.

Exposition (10)

- 8–10 The paper is carefully crafted to ease reading and understanding for the target audience. Mathematical language and notation is used appropriately. Citations clearly acknowledge any sources used.
- 5–7 The paper is sufficiently crafted that peers can easily discern what was intended whenever expository roughness is encountered. Mathematical language and notation is used appropriately most of the time.
- 3–4 Peers must expend some effort to discern what was intended when expository roughness is encountered.
- 1–2 Substantial effort is needed to discern what is intended.

Synthesis (2)

2 The paper provides readers with greater insight than they would receive by simply reading the papers sources. For example, the paper successfully synthesises material from several sources and provides relevant connections, insights, applications or similar that are due to the author.

Process (3)

- 3 The draft was complete and carefully written and represented the best capabilities of the author. The revision successfully took into account but was not limited to the provided feedback.
- 2 The draft was complete and the revision successfully incorporated the most important provided feedback.
- 1 The draft was not suitable for substantial feedback, for example because it contained too many flaws obvious to the author or because it contained too little text altogether; or most of the provided feedback was ignored.