Appendix

Environmental Chemistry literature review rubric.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area evaluated** | **Excellent (10 pts.)** | **Good (6–9 pts.)** | **Fair (2–5 pts.)** | **Poor/missing (0–1)** |
| **Works cited page** | * Correct ACS format
* includes at least four sources cited
* correct source categories
* alphabetical order
 | * ACS format with minor errors
* includes three cited sources
* alphabetical order
* missing a source category
 | * ACS format with major errors
* includes two cited sources
* no alphabetical order
* missing more than one source category
 | * ACS format not attempted or not present
* results in honor code violation
 |
| **Area evaluated** | **Excellent (9–15 pts.)** | **Good (7–8 pts.)** | **Fair (5–6 pts.)** | **Poor/missing (1–3)** |
| **Using cited work** | * valuable information used from each source
* works cited correctly
* proper ACS format
 | * half of the sources used
* proper ACS format or minor citation errors
 | * most information taken from one source
* incorrect format or major errors
 | * No information from sources
* Minimal or no citations
 |
| **Area evaluated** | **Excellent (9–15 pts.)** | **Good (7–8 pts.)** | **Fair (5–6 pts.)** | **Poor/missing (1–4 pts.)** |
| **Grammar, spelling, neatness** | * proper grammar usage with no errors
* No spelling errors
* written in third person
* neat, organized
* appropriate images/charts
* title page is well designed and has appropriate image
 | * 1–3 grammar errors
* 1–2 words misspelled
* written in third person
* mostly neat and organized
* title page is well designed, but image may not be appropriate to subject being discussed
 | * 4–6 grammar errors
* 3–6 misspelled words
* includes first or second person
* lacking in neatness and/or organization
* title page is neat, but not well designed, image may be inappropriate or missing
 | * more than six grammar errors
* more than six misspelled words
* includes first or second person
* lacking in neatness and/or organization
* title page is missing or handwritten, image missing or inappropriate
 |
| **Area evaluated** | **Excellent (43–60 pts.)** | **Good (35 – 42 pts.)** | **Fair (17 – 34 pts.)** | **Poor/missing (1–16 pts.)** |
| **Content** | * includes introduction and conclusion
* subject thoroughly discussed
* logical progression
* writing style clear and concise
* original question or problem is thoroughly discussed
* avenues for future research well discussed
* greater than minimum length
 | * introduction and/or conclusion somewhat brief or weak
* discussion of subject is good
* progression mostly logical
* writing style mostly clear/concise
* original question or problem is somewhat discussed
* future research somewhat discussed
* minimum length
 | * introduction and/or conclusion missing or very weak
* inadequate discussion of subject
* progression weak
* writing style is not clear and/or concise
* original question or problem is briefly answered
* future research is poorly related to material discussed
* less than minimum length
 | * introduction and conclusion missing
* very inadequate discussion of subject
* progression illogical
* writing style not clear or concise
* original question or problem is not addressed
* no avenues for future research provided
* significantly shorter than minimum length
 |