

## COSC 480 Senior Seminar Scoring Guide for Written Assignments

Written Communication	<i>Inadequate (1 pt.)</i>	<i>Needs Improvement (2 pts.)</i>	<i>Adequate (3 pts.)</i>	<i>Excellent (4 pts.)</i>
Clarity (Whole Essay)	There appears to be no organization of the essay's contents.	Organization of the essay is difficult to follow due to a combination of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate transitions</li> <li>Rambling format</li> </ul>	The essay can easily be followed. A combination of the following is apparent: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic transitions are used.</li> <li>A structured format is used.</li> </ul>	The essay can easily be followed. A combination of the following is apparent: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effective transitions are used.</li> <li>A polished format is used.</li> </ul>
Mechanical (Sentences)	Sentences and paragraphs are difficult to read and understand due to poor grammar or mechanics	The essay contains numerous grammatical and mechanical errors.	The essay contains minimal grammatical or mechanical errors.	The essay is clear and concise and contains no grammatical or mechanical errors.
Organization (Paragraphs and Bibliography Page)	Unclear and vague paragraph distinctions/Citations on bibliography page are not consisted with topic area.	Thoughts or issues expressed in the paragraph breakdown need more modification. Not enough citations were used (or noted) on the bibliography page.	Paragraph organization was good. The bibliography page was constructed in an orderly and correct style.	Eloquent paragraph organization/Excellent references used in the bibliography page

Content	<i>Inadequate (2 pts.)</i>	<i>Needs Improvement (4 pts.)</i>	<i>Adequate (6 pts.)</i>	<i>Excellent (8 pts.)</i>
Followed the Assignment Directions	The paper has no apparent relation to the directions of the assignments.	Some of the paper follows the directions.	Most of the paper follows the directions.	The paper follows the directions precisely. (i.e. the sections are labeled, directions for finding the article are clear, all required information, etc.)
Explains the technical issue	Names the technical issue.	Attempts to explain the technical issue.	Technical details are accurate.	Is both concise and complete in technical explanation
Stakeholders are Identified and what values are at stake.	Does not identify who is impacted by the ethical dilemma or how they are impacted. Does not explain the values are stake.	Specifies either who is impacted by the ethical dilemma OR how they are impacted, but not both. Attempts to explain the values at stakes.	Specifies who is impacted by the ethical dilemma AND how they are impacted. Attempts to explain the values at stakes.	Specifies who is impacted by the ethical dilemma AND how they are impacted. Clearly explains the values at stake.
Used the four steps in the Analysis process	None of the steps used in the analysis process	The paper included some of the steps for an ethical analysis of the case.	The paper included all of the four steps to support a <b>reasonable</b> ethical analysis of the case.	The paper included all of the four steps to support a <b>strong</b> ethical analysis of the case.
Conclusion: Justified preferred position	Didn't pick a position	Picked, but didn't justify (with or without the four step analysis process)	Picked and tried to justify (using the four step analysis process) weak	Convinced me—Essay provides a persuasive argument that clearly supports the position.
Cited references (whole paper)	The paper has no apparent citations related to the topic.	The paper included minimum citations that did not related to the position of the topic or point of view.	Several citations were used throughout the paper to support position.	The paper included an appropriate number of cited references throughout paper, which supported the position of the topic.