

Rubrics for Assessment - Keurig Case Study

Group Poster Rubric:

CSM 10: Group Posters at Community Forum on Coffee Sustainability, 9 December 2015						
<i>Poster title</i>						
<i>Authors</i>						
<i>Rubric scored by</i>						
<i>Numerical Grade</i>	100-95	85	75	65		
	Accomplished (A)	Progressing (B)	Developing (C)	Does not meet criteria (D)	Comments	Numerical Grade
Poster Presentation - visual style	<i>Poster is visually appealing in engaging the audience and provokes thought to promote deeper understanding of the core problem and proposed solution. Elements (text, figures, graphs) within the poster are all clean and legible, making it easy to read and understand the core ideas.</i>	<i>Poster is visually appealing, but lacks some clarity in conveying the core ideas. Formatting issues remain for some elements (text, figures, graphs) in ways that hinder clear understanding.</i>	<i>Poster contains the core information, but it is not presented in a visually appealing or coherent fashion. Elements (text, figures, graphs) have errors or missing information which hinder clear communication of the core ideas.</i>	<i>Incoherent presentation, perfunctory, barely any effort to make the material interesting. Unclear articulation of the core problem and proposed solution.</i>		
Organization of Ideas & logical flow	<i>Follows guidelines on poster template; text and graphics are organized in a logical flow that facilitates clear understanding of the core problem and proposed solution..</i>	<i>Follows guidelines; arrangement of some text / graphic elements needs work; logical flow is not smooth to help audience follow the discussion of the core problem and proposed solution.</i>	<i>Missing a minor component; text / graphic elements lack focus; overall organization is not streamlined enough to promote understanding of the core problem and proposed solution.</i>	<i>Lacks organization; missing major components of the assignment, muddled on the core problem and proposed solution.</i>		

**CSM 10: Group Posters at Community Forum on Coffee Sustainability,
9 December 2015**

Content: rigor and depth of critical thinking	<i>In depth presentation of the core problem and proposed solution. and supporting arguments backed up by evidence; critical consideration of different perspectives and strengths / weaknesses; good use of Problem Tree analysis; solution is clearly focused on our campus and is realistic.</i>	<i>The core problem and proposed solution are presented but not thoroughly analyzed, leaving some ambiguities in the supporting arguments; Problem Tree could be used more effectively; solution applies to campus, but may not be feasible or realistic.</i>	<i>The core problem and proposed solution are described but lack depth of critical thinking and analysis of supporting arguments or evidence; rationale/justification for choice of core problem is unclear, or lacks clear link to proposed solution; Problem Tree used poorly; solution is not campus specific or is unrealistic.</i>	<i>The core problem is not clearly identified, nor is clear solution presented. Problem Tree not used or very poorly used. Solution vague, not campus specific, and unrealistic.</i>		
Use of Evidence	<i>Relevant information is taken from reliable source(s) with enough interpretation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis; viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning. Helps clearly justify choice of the core problem and proposed solution; good use of evidence to back up proposed solution.</i>	<i>Relevant information is taken from reliable source(s) with some interpretation and synthesis; viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning; supporting evidence does not fully justify choice of the core problem and proposed solution.</i>	<i>Relevant Information is taken from perhaps various source(s) without interpretation or synthesis; viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question; some sources may not pass the C.R.A.P test; lacks justification for choice of the core problem and proposed solution.</i>	<i>Relevant and reliable resources and evidence are not provided to support ideas; no sources pass the C.R.A.P test; no evidence to support choice of the core problem and proposed solution.</i>		
				TOTAL SCORE (100 pts possible)		
				Score (out of 25 pts)		
Additional Comments:						

Group Memo Rubric:

Criteria	Points for Assessment		
	5	3	1
Organization	Follow guidelines; consistent writing	Facts misplaced, inconsistent writing	Lacks organization
Grammar	No typos, clear sentences, easy to read	Typos, incomplete sentences	Substantial errors
References	Citations in text; mostly primary literature	Citations not in text; mostly secondary literature	No citations
Concept Map	Well presented in text	Presented	Not presented