MINI - BBQ POST RUBRIC

1. **BBQ Blog Post**. An easily displayed post on the BBQ Blog (sites.jmu.edu/gbio103) that thoroughly answers the question.
2. **Contributors.** List of team contributors (full names) at the end of the BBQ Blog Post.
3. **Sources**. Embed links to the sources your team used to answer the BBQ. **You don't need reliability statements.** Instead, create hyperlinks from your post to the sources used. If you are using a visual or video post prompt, you can create a list of citations at the end – that hyperlink to the sources.

GRADING RUBRIC (50PTS)

Score	Characteristic	Excellent (full)	Promising (half)	Developing (1/4)
	Content (50%; 25pts)	Answer correctly reflects biology and research related to the BBQ.	Answer misrepresents some components of biology and research related to the BBQ.	Answer does not correctly reflect the biology and research related to the BBQ. (e.g., the answer is too simplistic)
	Feedback and Integration (30%; 15pts)	Answer integrates content and feedback from IPAs, TPAs and BBQ posts.	Answer integrates some content and feedback from IPAs, TPAs and BBQ posts.	Answer does not integrate content and feedback from IPAs, TPAs and BBQ posts.
	Sources (10%; 5pts)	All content supported by links to sources – not databases – used to construct the BBQ answer.	Some content not supported by links to sources.	No links to sources or links to databases instead of sources
	Answer Format/Logistics (10%, 5pts)	Aligns with assignment prompt/logistics.	Is missing some components of assignment prompt/logistics.	Does not align with the assignment prompt/logistics.
	Total			

BBQ Final Post Rubric

Big BBQ posts should answer the big BBQ by integrating information from the answers to mini-BBQs. It seems to go without saying that this post should be significantly longer than the posts you completed for the mini-BBQs. Also, there may be post prompts that are too restrictive to use, as they may not allow for full answer exploration (e.g., 90 second, pop-quiz).

4. BBQ Blog Post. An easily displayed post on the BBQ Blog (sites.jmu.edu/gbio103) that thoroughly answers the question.
5. List of team contributors (full names) at the end of the BBQ Blog Post.
6. Sources and Reliability Statements. Add a sources page to your **team** folder on the Wiki (gbio103.pbworks.com) where you list the **5-6** sources you used to complete your post along with reliability statements for each sources. Indicate High/Medium/Low reliability and WHY – based on features of the author, publishing source, and scientific peer-review. (File name: **SourcesBBQ4LastName,** example – **SourcesBBQ4Shibla**). If you are working with a partner you each need have a source file in your respective team folders (yes, they can be exactly the same – probably best if they are).

Grading Rubric – 150pts

Characteristic	Excellent (full)	Promising (half)	Developing (1/4)
Content (60%; 90pts)	Answer correctly reflects biology and research related to the BBQ.	Answer misrepresents some components of biology and research related to the BBQ.	Answer does not correctly reflect the biology and research related to the BBQ. (e.g., the answer is too simplistic)
Integration (10%; 15pts)	Answer integrates content and feedback from the mini BBQ posts.	Answer integrates some of the content and feedback from the mini BBQ posts.	Answer does not integrate content and feedback from the mini BBQ posts.
Sources and Post Format (10%; 15pts)	All content supported by embedded links to sources – not databases – used to construct the BBQ answer.	Some content not supported by embedded links to sources.	No embedded links to sources or links to databases instead of sources
Reliability Statement (on Wiki, 20%; 30pts)	Reliability statement clearly indicates reliability of cited sources with details on author, source and scientific peer-review.	Reliability statement misrepresents the reliability of cited sources OR is missing details on author, source and scientific peer-review.	Reliability statement misrepresents the reliability of cited sources AND is missing details on author, source and scientific peer-review.