|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Meets Expectation****(8-10)** | **Below Expectation****(4-7)** | **Unsatisfactory****(0-3)** | **Draft Points** |
| Materials | Quantities, dimensions, brand/model of devices present. Comprehensive. | Materials listed are adequately listed however are lacking dimensions/quantities | Materials section is undeveloped or largely missing.  |  |
| Rationale and justification for design | Very comprehensively reasoned. Details include desired outcomes, insight as to the importance of the chosen method, why specific method was chosen, and how forwards research on the topic | Rationale included and touches on many criteria for meeting expectation, but is not as thoroughly reasoned to warrant meeting expectation.  | Rationale is weak and does not provide adequate reasoning, insights, importance of chosen method. Missing key aspects that are necessary for meeting expectation. |  |
| Development of Design or Experimentation | Comprehensively develops techniques and processes needed to create prototype  | Research lacks variety, and some sources may or may not be appropriate. | Research is lacking in both variety and appropriateness. |  |
| Professionally presented verbally and graphics used | Work was professionally presented using clean diagrams (not hand drawn) and verbal communication is of a polished nature | Diagrams are not to the standard of meeting expectation and/or verbal communication is not of a polished and professional nature. Questions within text do not support professional requirements. | Diagrams are mostly hand-drawn and are without captions and figure numbers. Verbiage is unprofessional with a high volume of “common speak”. |  |
| Terminology | Use of scientific terms and concepts reveals a deep understanding of methodological elements of the project. | Scientific terms and concepts are used correctly. | Scientific terms and concepts are used incorrectly, or topic is discussed in completely nonscientific terms. |  |
| Work Plan & Gantt Chart | Comprehensive work plan that includes each group member(s)’ roles and process is crisply thought out and meticulously planned. | Work plan is present and follows a cohesive course of action. | Work plan is brief or is not actionable. |  |
| Mechanics | Grammar and usage are correct and contribute to clarity. Punctuation is correct and paragraphing adds to organizational structure. | Very few mistakes in grammar and usage. Paragraphing may create minor problems. Spelling and punctuation are almost entirely correct.  | Errors in grammar and usage affect meaning. Paragraphing is missing or does not relate to organization of text. Frequent spelling errors. Punctuation is often missing or incorrect.  |  |
| Limitations | Thoughtful analysis of potential limitations of the project have been considered. Reasonable and realistic. | Limitations noted but are very basic in nature. | Limitations are weakly communicated or considered. Could be unrealistic or not directly associated to the study or its stakeholders. |  |
| Organization & Coherence  | Organization enhances the central theme. Sequencing is logical and transitions are smooth.  | Organization is adequate. Introduction may need more anticipation. Conclusion may lack closure.  | Organization is not clear. Connections are confusing. Introduction and conclusion are present but are unclear or incomplete. |  |
| APA In-Text Citations | Citations 100% accurate, no errors. | Citations mostly correct with specific errors repeated, or few random errors. | Citations mostly incorrect and largely in error, or no citations present. |  |
| References Cited | All sources are correctly cited and are 100% accurate. | Some errors in formatting exist, but section is largely correct. | Many errors in format or only a brief list present. No references cited section present. |  |
| **Total & Comments:** | \_\_\_\_\_**110** |