Environmental Policy Memo Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attribute | Approaching (0-2 points) | Meets (3-4points)  | Exceeds(5 points) | Points |
| Content and Subject Knowledge  | * Policy and issue undefined.
* Memo does not relate course content to examples and/ or supporting data of policy issue.
* Reflects limited understanding of subject matter and associated literature.
* Few details and facts presented; concepts not in a logical sequence.
* Policy is unrealistic.
 | * Policy and issue is defined and includes few details that demonstrate a basic mastery of the topic.
* Memo relates course content to examples and supporting data of policy issue.
* Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature.
* Incorporates details, facts, and concepts in a logical sequence.
* Policy is realistic.
 | * Policy and issue is well defined and includes a variety of details and data that demonstrate a high level of mastery of the topic.
* Memo displays an impressive level of depth of student’s ability to relate course content to examples and supporting data of policy issue.
* Reflects mastery of subject matter and associated literature.
* Incorporates comprehensive analysis of details, facts, and concepts in a logical sequence.
* Potential that policy could be adopted.
 | \_\_\_\_\_/ |
| Critical Thinking | * Memo has a limited perspective on key concepts throughout assignment.
* Policy ideas, actions and outcomes are not incorporated.
 | * Memo displays a command of critical thinking skills in the presentation of material and supporting statements.
* Policy ideas, actions and outcomes are somewhat incorporated.
 | * Memo follows a strategic approach in presenting examples of problem solving or critical thinking.
* Logical conclusions are drawn, which are not immediately obvious and include actions and outcomes supported by reliable references.
 | \_\_\_\_\_/ |
| Organization of Ideas and Format | * Memo has a variety of inconsistencies throughout.
* Organization is poor and many sections mentioned above are missing.
 | * Memo is mostly consistent, student demonstrates a good skill level in formatting and organizing material in assignment, with a few errors.
* Organization is logical and all sections mentioned above are included.
 | * Memo is very consistent and highly organized, presenting the policy issue in a clear light, giving options to the reader through actions and outcomes..
* Organization is excellent and all sections mentioned above included.
 | \_\_\_\_\_/ |
| Quality of Product/ Writing | * Writing is weak, product is messy.
* Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent.
* Pictures and graphics do not relate to content and/ or are inappropriate.
 | * Writing is adequate, product is neat.
* Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent.
* Pictures and graphics mostly relate to content and are appropriate.
 | * Writing and product are publication quality.
* No grammatical or spelling errors apparent.
* Pictures and graphics enhance content and are appropriate.
 | \_\_\_\_\_/ |
| References and Support | * Includes no references or supporting evidence.
* Sources used for research lack variety or are not reliable.
 | * Incorporates some references from literature, supporting evidence and personal experience.
* Sources used for research include some variety and are reliable.
 | * Uses additional references outside of the literature, readings, supporting evidence and/or personal experience.
* Sources used for research include variety, utilize data and are reliable.
* Student exceeds minimum research requirement using at least five sources.
 | \_\_\_\_\_/ |
| Total PointsComments: | \_\_\_\_\_/ |

Use for Gallery Walk and/ or Reflections

Examples of peer comments that demonstrate higher levels of thinking:

* “Some common themes I see between your environmental memo and what we are learning in class are….” (analysis)
* “These topics/ themes are significant if we consider the relationship between ….” (synthesis)
* “What you are saying is strengthened by the following evidence ….” (evaluation)