

Paper Four: Proposal Content [Weight = 60% of grade]

	EXEMPLARY	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	BELOW EXPECTATIONS
Adherence to Assignment GUIDELINES	Achieves all purpose(s) creatively and fully. Exceeds all assignment guidelines. Original and creative work. Exemplifies "best" in this assignment.	Clearly centered in course-related knowledge. Good academic paper. Meets all guidelines and goes beyond these in some ways.	Purpose(s) of assignment is clear and adequately met. Meets all posted guidelines for "C" work. Produces an example of average college-level work.	Purpose is not clear or insufficient details to support ideas. Does not meet guidelines for "C" work. One or more key requirement is not met.
USE of COURSE CONCEPTS and THEORIES to Demonstrate CRITICAL THINKING	Demonstrates high level of understanding and integration of course concepts. Develops new information or new ways of applying concepts and theories. Highly creative scholarship.	Moves beyond superficial understanding to show strong facility with theories, concepts, and academic language. Applies concepts creatively. Some originality of thought is evident.	Presents ideas that reflect assigned material without going well beyond assignment in terms of critical thinking. Solid work but not a creative, original application of ideas	Superficial understanding at best OR no demonstration of grasp of topic. Course concepts are applied incorrectly. Uses "everyday" language. "Parrots" texts rather than develops ideas.
USE of SOURCES to EFFECTIVELY SUPPORT THESIS. DOCUMENTATION (Current APA style for internal citation and bibliography)	Quotes and cites all scholarly and media sources fully and accurately (APA). Innovatively advances insights with strong, cited support for original insights. Includes outside research, sources.	Advances solid insights and understanding with sound evidence, well-developed ideas. Cites relevant outside references. All supporting cites and quotes are in APA style, in text and in bibliography.	Understanding of topics and theories primarily based in direct quotes from assigned texts. Does explain key terms, Does use quotes and cites of key sources. Offers adequate support, with generally accurate citations.	Few or no cites to sources. Ideas incorrectly presented or not developed. Key concepts not explained well. Gives opinions unsupported by facts and cites. Little or no support. Citations missing or incorrect.
DEVELOPMENT and ORGANIZATION	Topics and sub-topics are developed fully and thoroughly. Uses and explains course concepts very well. Effective, detail-oriented scholarly presentation.	Ideas are well connected, developed with strong incorporation of course concepts and sources. Ideas related are defined and developed in depth.	Topics developed logically and fully enough to apply concepts. Adequate definition and explanation of concepts is provided. The paper has a logical and coherent structure.	Topics, subtopics not properly developed; superficial or cursory development of ideas. Lacks structure, transitions between ideas. Illogical or ineffective organization.

Paper Four: Proposal Format [Weight = 15% of grade]

	EXEMPLARY	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	BELOW EXPECTATIONS
FORMATTING (Conforms to business report format: "BRF")	Descriptive headings, sub-headings. Application of all elements of BRF in design and layout produce a visually attractive, highly readable document.	Format and design add to reader's understanding. Readability of document is good due to above-average application of BRF conventions throughout.	BRF structure is applied in a generally skillful way. All key elements of spacing, titling and labeling and so on are done appropriately. May be some errors, but overall OK	Flaws in spacing (double-spaced' or over- or under-spacing of paragraphs). Use of headings / subheadings is missing or incorrect. Format detracts from readability.
MECHANICS (Spelling, Syntax, Grammar, Language Usage, Punctuation)	Work enhanced by strong skill in language usage, diction, vocabulary, style, syntax. Excellent writing.	Readability enhanced by facility with language and sentence conventions. Skill in writing is above average.	Some errors in mechanics, though OK in terms of college-level literacy. Should be proofread.	Obvious flaws in grammar, sentence structure, spelling, punctuation. Little evidence of effort. Literacy issues.

Paper Four: Round-table Discussions [Weight = 25% of grade]

	EXEMPLARY	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	BELOW EXPECTATIONS
PRESENTATION of PROJECT PLAN	Clearly developed as to theory and method. Some sources are presented. Solicited specific feedback. Clear and concise. Makes strong case for research significance. Anticipates and addresses possible questions.	Proposal is presented clearly and in some detail. Theory and method are supported with some research. Plan provides a rationale for research significance. Basic questions are addressed in advance.	Proposal is developed adequately as to topic, theory, and method. Some research supports significance of plan. Information is summarized but could be more concise or clearer, more in depth.	Plan is not developed fully enough as to theory, and/or method and/or basic research. Evidence of reflection on topic or approach is missing. Significance is not presented or supported well.
RESPONSES to PLANS PRESENTED BY OTHERS	Strong contributions with thoughtful dialogue and clear evidence that concepts and theories are understood well. Offers relevant responses to three or four others which offer constructive critique, good ideas for revision.	Good contributions that engage colleagues in a healthy discussion; relevant responses to two or three others. Some evidence that theories and strategies are understood. Accurately identifies areas for revision but without specifics.	Adequate contribution to topics; relevant responses to at least one other. Adequately extends thinking, adds ideas of a general nature to discussion. Some reliance on relevant theories, approaches, research.	Contribution adds little (or nothing) to the discussion. Responds in a relevant way to few or no other discussants OR dominates.. Does not rely upon course concepts or methods. Generally lacking in academic focus.
ENGAGEMENT with OTHER DISCUSSANTS	Demonstrates high level of active listening with excellent ideas as to relevant theories or sources or similar. Strong resource for others. High contribution, no dominating.	Attentive to all and responsive in providing constructive suggestions for specific revisions or additions to research plan. Offers some good ideas to other.	Responses express some level of engagement with others with some connection to course material included as support. Engaged listener offering somewhat general inputs.	Minimal engagement with discussion. Little or no relevant input. ("I agree." Or "Great idea!") OR offers general, not academic input. OR attempts to dominate discussion.