AMDM Gallery Walk Rubric—Population Data (U4B3 #14) Name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Score |
| Crtiteria | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 | Group 4 |
| Table and scatterplot of population data for at least five years AND source | The data are correct and present. Both variables are labeled. There is an appropriate title for the display. The data is professionally displayed and the source is cited. | The data are correct and present. The data was correctly displayed, but there are questions about what was being displayed because something was missing. The data was fairly professionally displayed. Source is cited. | The data are present but questionably correct and/or the professionalism of the data was poor, but the group was still able to display something that made sense. Source is cited. | There are missing data and it is so poorly displayed (due to missing info and/or professionalism) that there was complete confusion to what was being displayed and/or no source cited. |  |  |  |  |
| Can the data be modeled by an exponential function? With Explanation/ justification | States whether the data can be modeled with an exponential function and sufficiently explains why using words and calculations and a comparison to other models (linear). |  States whether the data can be modeled with an exponential function and sufficiently explains why using words and calculations. | States if the data can be modeled with an exponential function but explanations and justifications are weak and in question. | Does not state if the data could be modeled by an exponential function and/or explanations and justifications do not make any sense. |  |  |  |  |
| Model | Model is correct; when tested, yields results very close to the actual data. | Model is almost correct; when tested, yields results close to the actual data. | Model is not accurate; when tested, yields results far from the actual data. | Model is wrong; it is the incorrect type of model for the data and does not yield results that follow the same type of pattern. |  |  |  |  |
| Prediction | The prediction is correct according to the model provided and it is clear what year the prediction is for. | The prediction differs slightly from what it should be according to the model provided or it is not clear what year the prediction is for. | The prediction is incorrect according to the model provided and/or it is not clear what year the prediction is for. | The prediction is missing. |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Work | Highest quality of work | Pretty good quality of work | Questionable quality of work | Unprofessional quality of work |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Score** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Score |
| Crtiteria | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Group 5 | Group 6 | Group 7 | Group 8 |
| Table of population data for at least five years AND source | The data are correct and present. Both variables are labeled. There is an appropriate title for the display. The data is professionally displayed and the source is cited. | The data are correct and present. The data was correctly displayed, but there are questions about what was being displayed because something was missing. The data was fairly professionally displayed. Source is cited. | The data are present but questionably correct and/or the professionalism of the data was poor, but the group was still able to display something that made sense. Source is cited. | There are missing data and it is so poorly displayed (due to missing info and/or professionalism) that there was complete confusion to what was being displayed and/or no source cited. |  |  |  |  |
| Can the data be modeled by an exponential function? With Explanation/ justification | States whether the data can be modeled with an exponential function and sufficiently explains why using words and calculations and a comparison to other models (linear). |  States whether the data can be modeled with an exponential function and sufficiently explains why using words and calculations. | States if the data can be modeled with an exponential function but explanations and justifications are weak and in question. | Does not state if the data could be modeled by an exponential function and/or explanations and justifications do not make any sense. |  |  |  |  |
| Model | Model is correct; when tested, yields results very close to the actual data. | Model is almost correct; when tested, yields results close to the actual data. | Model is not accurate; when tested, yields results far from the actual data. | Model is wrong; it is the incorrect type of model for the data and does not yield results that follow the same type of pattern. |  |  |  |  |
| Prediction | The prediction is correct according to the model provided and it is clear what year the prediction is for. | The prediction differs slightly from what it should be according to the model provided or it is not clear what year the prediction is for. | The prediction is incorrect according to the model provided and/or it is not clear what year the prediction is for. | The prediction is missing. |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Work | Highest quality of work | Pretty good quality of work | Questionable quality of work | Unprofessional quality of work |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Score** |  |  |  |  |