

Rubric for GA1

Group # _____

	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent
<p>Article Summaries 4 points At least two popular articles from reasonable sources are identified, and an accurate summary of the contents of the articles are provided</p>	<p>0 Not completed, or clearly lacks effort.</p>	<p>1 Articles are inappropriate, or summaries are brief and uninformative</p>	<p>2 Appropriate articles identified. Summaries are inadequate or inaccurate, and show little insight.</p>	<p>3 Appropriate articles identified. Summaries are accurate, succinct, and informative.</p>	<p>4 Characteristics of "Very Good" category plus some additional element: additional sources identified, conflicting sources identified and a discussion of the conflict is provided, or other efforts beyond the basic description of this category</p>
<p>Worksheet (includes hypothesis) 10 points The assignment should narrow the project focus to a specific and scientifically valid hypothesis which the team will investigate. Experimental design worksheet should be fully completed.</p>					<p>10 one point awarded per question</p>
<p>Citations 1 points Please refer to the project description document for a detailed description of how to cite popular sources</p>	<p>0 Citations are present but do not conform to required format</p>				<p>1 Citations are correct</p>

Rubric for GA2 – The annotated bibliography – 20 points

There should be a MINIMUM of three primary research articles, or ONE for EACH member of your group. Each one is worth 6 points (18 points total) If your group needs to submit more than three I'll count the best three for grading purposes but don't overdo it with a million articles. (If your group has only three people you can still submit 4-5 articles!) The remaining 2 points will be assigned for the correctness of the citation style.

Remember that the three articles that will be graded should be PRIMARY ORIGINAL RESEARCH. Review articles are useful and can be listed, but will not earn any points as one of the three mandatory articles that will be graded for this assignment.

Each article will be assigned points based on the rubric below:

Article Annotations (best three articles, 18 points total):

- | | |
|----------|--|
| 0 points | Not completed and/or completely lacking in effort, and/or does not follow the prescribed format |
| 2 points | Needs improvement – (<i>includes any articles that are not primary literature regardless of how well the summary is written</i>) summaries lack in sufficient detail or are inaccurate assessments of the literature, and/or are not directly relevant to the hypothesis of the project, and/or relevance to the hypothesis is not articulated |
| 4 points | Good – decent summary provided but may be confusing, poorly worded, or difficult to understand in a minor way, and/or explanation of the relevance to the project hypothesis is unclear or questionable |
| 6 points | Excellent – completely conforms to the prescribed format and content, accurately summarizes the article content and provides a clear explanation of the relevance of the content to the project hypothesis |

Citation (2 points):

- | | |
|----------|---|
| 0 points | Not completed, or prescribed citation format was completely ignored |
| 1 point | Minor errors but attempted to adhere to prescribed format |
| 2 points | All citations conform to prescribed format |



Rubric for GA3

Assignment total = 30 points

	Not Completed	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent
<p>Content: Introduction to the topic 5 points The topic is clearly presented to the audience, and is easily understood</p>	0	<p>1 The topic of the project is not immediately evident.</p>	<p>2 It takes the reader some significant effort or time to understand the main topic.</p>	<p>3 The topic is mostly clear but could be better stated or better organized.</p>	<p>4 The topic is clear.</p>	<p>5 The topic is extremely clear and easily understood.</p>
<p>Content: presentation of supporting evidence 12 points Key information from the primary literature is described in terms that a non-scientific audience can understand; the cited evidence is directly relevant to the topic. The evidence is properly interpreted and comes from reputable sources.</p>	0	<p>1 2 3 Supporting scientific evidence is scant, not explained, completely irrelevant to the topic, or not from a reputable source</p>	<p>4 5 6 Supporting evidence is not explained in non-scientific terms; the validity of the evidence is questionable; report is full of jargon that is not explained or evidence that is not relevant to the stated topic</p>	<p>7 8 9 Scientific evidence is presented, and is explained in non-scientific terms; the quantity of evidence or the quality of the explanation could be improved. One or two facts are not relevant to the topic.</p>	<p>10 11 Valid scientific evidence is presented in non-scientific terms that are easy to follow and convincing to the reader. The data seem relevant to the topic at hand.</p>	<p>12 Valid scientific evidence is presented in terms that are easy to follow and convincing to the reader. The team has shown extraordinary insight in identifying high-quality, relevant data, or in interpreting the specific shortcomings of the data that are available.</p>
<p>Content: Conclusion 5 points An interpretation of the preponderance evidence is presented in terms that are understandable by a non-scientific audience; The conclusion is consistent with and supported by the evidence that is presented.</p>	0	<p>1 It is completely unclear how the students interpreted the factual data they have presented; the stated conclusion seems contradictory to the evidence presented.</p>	<p>2 The conclusion is very confusing; it is difficult to understand how the students arrived at the conclusion; elements of the presented data do not seem to support the conclusion.</p>	<p>3 A conclusion is stated, and mostly agrees with the given evidence but could be improved in language or clarity (too vague or too technical)</p>	<p>4 A clear conclusion is given that seems consistent with the evidence provided.</p>	<p>5 The conclusion is very clear; the chosen evidence is entirely consistent with the conclusion. The reader is convinced of the validity of this conclusion</p>
<p>Style: 4 points Includes appropriate use of language, grammar, spelling and punctuation</p>		<p>0 Multiple errors, clear lack of proofreading detracts from the transcript; style is sloppy or inappropriately colloquial</p>	<p>1 Numerous errors; language is disorganized or difficult to follow</p>	<p>2 A few errors; word choice is awkward in a few places; language is difficult to follow in isolated spots</p>	<p>3 Very few errors; Generally well organized and easy to follow</p>	<p>4 No errors; language flows well and is very logical and easy to follow</p>
<p>Citations: 4 points Source information is appropriately cited. Citations comply with the prescribed format.</p>		<p>0 Numerous facts are given without proper citation; Citation does not follow any appropriate format; References are not listed at the end of the document</p>	<p>1 Multiple errors in citation were made; Citations are inconsistent in format.</p>	<p>2 Several items that should have been cited were overlooked; A few errors were made in citation format</p>	<p>3 Most facts are appropriately cited; Citation style adheres to a prescribed format.</p>	<p>4 All facts are appropriately cited. Citation completely adheres to a prescribed format.</p>



Rubric for GA4: The video presentation

Assignment total = 35 points: Prof. Farny's rating = 25 points (using rubric below); 10 points from average of peer surveys (Qualtrics surveys)

	Not Completed	Unacceptable	Needs Improvement	Acceptable	Very Good	Excellent
Content: Introduction to the topic 5 points The topic is clearly presented to the audience, and is easily understood .	0 There is no explicit definition of the topic	1 The topic of the project is not immediately evident.	2 It takes the viewer some significant effort to understand the main topic.	3 The topic is mostly clear but could be better stated or better organized.	4 The topic is clear.	5 The topic is extremely clear and easily understood.
Content: presentation of supporting evidence 5 points Key information from the primary literature is described in terms that a non-scientific audience can understand; the cited evidence is directly relevant to the topic. The evidence is properly interpreted and comes from reputable sources.	0 There is no supporting evidence presented	1 Supporting scientific evidence is scant, not explained, completely irrelevant to the topic, or not from a reputable source	2 Supporting evidence is not explained in non-scientific terms; the validity of the evidence is questionable; the team uses jargon that is not explained or evidence that is not relevant to the stated topic	3 Scientific evidence is presented, and is explained in non-scientific terms; the quantity of evidence or the quality of the explanation could be improved. One or two facts are not relevant to the topic.	4 Valid scientific evidence is presented in non-scientific terms that are easy to follow and convincing to the viewer. The data seem relevant to the topic at hand.	5 Valid scientific evidence is presented in terms that are easy to follow and convincing to the viewer. The team has shown extraordinary insight in identifying high-quality, relevant data, or in interpreting the specific shortcomings of the data that are available.
Content: Conclusion 5 points An interpretation of the preponderance of evidence is presented in terms that are understandable by a non-scientific audience; The conclusion is consistent with and supported by the evidence that is presented.	0 No conclusion is stated	1 It is completely unclear how the students interpreted the factual data they have presented; the stated conclusion seems contradictory to the evidence presented.	2 The conclusion is very confusing; it is difficult to understand how the students arrived at the conclusion; elements of the presented data do not seem to support the conclusion.	3 A conclusion is stated, and mostly agrees with the given evidence but could be improved in language or clarity (too vague or too technical)	4 A clear conclusion is given that seems consistent with the evidence provided.	5 The conclusion is very clear; the chosen evidence is entirely consistent with the conclusion. The viewer is convinced of the validity of this conclusion
Production: 5 points Includes editing, sound and light, special effects.	0 Unable to see and/or hear the video well enough to evaluate it.	1 Defects in sound and/or lighting quality make it difficult to watch and understand, and significantly detract from the final product.	2 Some defects in editing, sound quality or lighting quality detract somewhat from the viewer's experience.	3 Editing, sound and lighting do not interfere with the viewer's experience, but neither do they enhance it.	4 Students made an effort to enhance the quality of the finished product with sound, lighting, effects and/or editing.	5 Outstanding effort was clearly made to produce a polished product. Very easy to see and hear. The team went above and beyond in production, editing, and/or effects.
Creativity:	0	1	2	3	4	5



<p>5 points The team attempted to present the information from a new or different point of view. The finished product is entertaining and interesting to watch.</p>	<p>Clear lack of effort put into production of the final video.</p>	<p>Presentation lacks in creativity.</p>	<p>The presentation is dry, or is too complicated or abstract for the viewer to follow.</p>	<p>The team attempted to present the story from a new or different point of view.</p>	<p>Topic is prevented from an interesting or different point of view.</p>	<p>The presentation was both interesting and enjoyable to watch. The team truly went "outside-the-box" to create a fresh and innovative way to present their project.</p>
--	---	--	---	---	---	---

The Qualtrics survey you will fill out will roughly follow the guidelines below. The average of the responses of your classmates will be combined to arrive at the final 10 points of the grade. (approximately 6-8 of your classmates will review your video.)

Your Name:

Group number of the video you are reviewing:

Your opinion of this video (you will click the appropriate buttons on the online survey form for each question):

Question	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
The topic is clear and easy to understand					
The evidence presented to support the argument is convincing					
The evidence is explained in a way that is easy for a non-					



scientific audience to understand					
The conclusion is clear and easy to understand					
I learned something from this video					
I feel that my classmates made an honest effort to do their best in creating this video					
I enjoyed watching this video					

Additional Comments:

