

NRS 543: Public Engagement with Science
Final Project Scoring

	A	B	C	D
1	Element	Excellent (A Project)	Very Good (B Project)	Good to Fair (C and lower)
2	Description of Action Taken and Documentation of Action	The action is described in specific detail; thorough documentation is provided.	The action is described with less detail; documentation is less detailed	Little detail is provided on the action taken; documentation is poor or nonexistent.
3	Justification of Action Taken	A detailed description of why the student chose this action is provided. It includes an explanation of what was gained or lost through this choice. A clear explanation of why this action is appropriate to the issue, the exigence, the course, and the student is provided.	The description of why this action was taken is adequate but lacks some specificity and/or depth. Ties to the course and the exigence are less than compelling.	The description is weak and not well thought out. Ties to the course and the exigence are unclear or incomplete.
4	Analysis of Level of Success with Action including Intended and Unintended Consequences	Substantial evidence the student used evaluation model concepts to plan, implement, and evaluate the action. Clear and detailed description of how successful or unsuccessful the student's choices were and discussion of why or why not this action achieved the desired outcome. Detailed explanation of how the student anticipated and prepared for potential intended or unintended consequences.	Some evidence the student used evaluation model concepts to plan, implement, and evaluate the action. Adequate description of the success of the student's choices; description of intended and unintended consequences is mostly clear.	Little evidence the student used evaluation model concepts to plan, implement, and evaluate the action. The consequences of this action are described poorly or inadequately, with little evidence that the student understands why this action was successful (or not).
5	Demonstration of Understanding of Public Engagement with Science and material from course texts	Clear evidence throughout the paper that the student understands concepts from class readings and discussions, including correct and appropriate citation of course texts.	Incorporation of ideas from course texts and class discussions is adequate, but is incomplete or demonstrates less than thorough understanding. Minor errors exist in the way texts are cited.	The paper either does not cite course texts or does so in an incomplete or inaccurate manner. Ideas from course texts and class discussions are not clearly articulated.
6	Course readings are used to justify, analyze, and critique the action project	Sustained attention to the ways that specific course texts illuminated or could be used to critique the action project.	Some mention of the ways that specific course texts illuminated or could be used to critique the action project.	Little to no mention of how specific course texts illuminated or could be used to critique the action project.
7	Action project critiques or extends course readings	Sustained attention to the ways the action project helped to illuminate or correct particular course texts through specific examples.	Some mention of the ways that the project helped to illuminate or correct course readings.	Little to no mention of how the action project shed light onto course texts.
8	Rhetorical understanding of public engagement with science	Uses the term rhetoric regularly and correctly. Illuminates and/or complicates a rhetorical approach to public engagement with science through direct citation of course texts.	Uses the term rhetoric but not always appropriately. Makes some mention of course literature that relates to rhetoric.	Rarely or never uses the term rhetoric and/or it is used incorrectly. No connection made between rhetorical readings and public engagement with science.
9	Quality of writing/editing	The paper is grammatically and syntactically flawless. The paper is imaginative, lively, and informative.	The paper contains minor writing and editing mistakes. It is well written, but fails to fully engage the reader.	The paper has major writing and editorial mistakes. It is difficult to read and/or comprehend.