**Collaborative Document Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Unsatisfactory-Beginning** | **Developing** | **Accomplished** | **Exemplary** | **Total** |
| **Content** | **0-30 points** | **31-35 points** | **36-40 points** | **41-45 points** | /45 |
| Ideas expressed lack an understanding of the topic. Content is irrelevant, off-topic, confusing to follow and/or contains insufficient information and facts. Lacks original thought, analysis, or real-world contexts and examples. Contains frequent inaccuracies in content, personal opinion, or illogical connections made. | Ideas expressed show some understanding of the topic but with limited research effort. Content is general in nature lacking depth or substance. Summarizes ideas with limited analysis, original thought, and few real-world contexts and examples. Contains some inaccuracies in content or unsupported connections. | Content shows an adequate understanding of the topic. Some research effort is evident in locating relevant, accurate, and reliable information and facts. Ideas expressed are mostly substantive with some original thought, logical thinking, and/or analysis with real-world contexts and examples for the most part. May contain some inconsistencies in content or some connections made may not be supported. | Content shows a thorough understanding of the topic. Substantive research effort is evident in locating relevant, accurate, and reliable information and facts. Ideas expressed include original thought, substantial depth, strong logical thinking, and analysis with real-world contexts and examples. Construction of new meaning and insights are evident. |
| **Links/ External Resources** | **0-6 points** | **7 points** | **8 points** | **9-10 points** | /10 |
| Links in the document to external resources (websites, articles, documents, audio/visual media, etc.) do not function properly, are rarely relevant to the content, or are missing. Multiple sources, if included, are not cited properly following APA guidelines (6th edition). | Some links in the document to external resources (websites, articles, documents, audio/visual media, etc.) may not work as intended, and/or are less than relevant to the content. Some sources may not be cited properly following APA guidelines (6th edition). | Links in the document to external resources (websites, articles, documents, audio/visual media, etc.) work as intended, are somewhat relevant to the content, and are cited properly following APA guidelines (6th edition) for the most part. | Links in the document to external resources (websites, articles, documents, audio/visual media, etc.) work as intended, enhance the content, and are cited properly following APA guidelines (6th edition). |
| **Organization & Format** | **0-6 points** | **7 points** | **8 points** | **9-10 points** | /10 |
| Collaborative document does not follow the required format and lacks a clear, logical organization. There is no hierarchy in structure and/or multiple required components are missing or incomplete. | Collaborative document follows the required format, is somewhat organized with limited use of headings, subheadings, and/or bulleted lists. Flow of content needs improvement. May be missing a required component and/or components may be less than complete. | Collaborative document follows the required format, is reasonably organized with the use of headings, subheadings, and/or bulleted lists. Content flows logically and includes required components for the most part. | Collaborative document follows the required format with consistent page design; is well-organized making effective use of headings, subheadings, and bulleted lists throughout. Content flows logically. Includes all required components. |

**Collaborative Document Rubric (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Unsatisfactory-Beginning** | **Developing** | **Accomplished** | **Exemplary** | Total |
| **Writing Quality** | **0-6 points** | **7 points** | **8 points** | **9-10 points** | /10 |
| Poor writing style lacking in standard English, clarity, language used, and/or frequent errors in grammar, punctuation, usage, and spelling. Needs work. | Average and/or casual writing style that is sometimes unclear and/or with some errors in grammar, punctuation, usage, and spelling. | Above average writing style using standard English with minor errors in grammar, punctuation, usage, and spelling. | Well written using standard English, characterized by elements of a strong writing style and basically free from grammar, punctuation, usage, and spelling errors. |
| **Contribution to Group**  **(Individual grade)** | **0-16 points** | **17-19 points** | **20-22 points** | **23-25 points** | /25 |
| Based on students’ journal reflections or feedback evaluation forms, group member rarely participated or contributed to the project towards achieving the goals and meeting the deadline. Did not share workload fairly and/or was a disruptive influence. | Based on students’ journal reflections or feedback evaluation forms, group member participated in the project but emphasis was in completing own work. Allowed others to assume leadership and/or may have not shared workload fairly towards achieving the project goals and meeting the deadline. | Based on students’ journal reflections or feedback evaluation forms, group member participated in the project and shared the workload. Contributed to the development of the document. Worked towards achieving the project goals and meeting the deadline. | Based on students’ journal reflections or feedback evaluation forms, group member participated fully in the project and shared the workload fairly. Contributed to the development of the document and assisted in editing others’ work to produce a polished, highly cohesive document. Coordinated group’s efforts and/or demonstrated leadership to facilitate and achieve the project goals and meet deadline. |
| **Timeliness\***  **(Group Grade)**  (\* unexcused late) | **Deduct 11 points-overall failing** | **Deduct 6-10 points** | **Deduct 1-5 points** | **0 points deducted** | /-- |
| Collaborative document is submitted 2-3 days (49-72 hours) after the deadline. | Collaborative document is submitted 1-2 days (25-48 hours) after the deadline. | Collaborative document is submitted within 1 day (24 hours) after the deadline. | Collaborative document is submitted by the deadline. |
| **TOTAL POINTS (sum of 6 Criteria)** | | | | | **/100** |

**Instructor Guide and Notes**

* Sharing and discussing your Rubric with students is a good idea so that you can all come to a common understanding of what is expected for the collaborative presentation assignment and how students’ work will be graded. Students should be able to visibly see a link to the Rubric at the beginning of the assignment in web-enhanced, hybrid, or fully online courses if a course management system is used (e.g., eCollege, Sakai, etc.).
* Rubrics make the process of grading more objective, consistent, and quicker (in the long run) and can also be used when reviewing any grade appeals.
* When grading:  
  + This rubric is designed for students to be graded as a “group,” rather than individually (i.e., we all ‘sink or swim’ together), to simulate team environments in real-world contexts. However, because not all students may contribute equally to a collaborative project, one of the criterion – “**Contribution to Group**” – has been included to acknowledge the efforts of those students who have done an outstanding job and have acted as a “leader” for the group (e.g., coordinating and communicating with the group, setting up a collaborative document tool such as Google-Documents to work collaboratively, uploading it to the Dropbox or posting to a Discussion Board, etc.).   
      
    **Note:** To help you determine the individual efforts and contributions of each student, it is recommended to include a “**Journal Reflection**” or “**Group Evaluation Form**” (that is graded) at the end of the collaborative project where students will self-assess their contribution, as well as the contributions of their group members for your consideration.
  + Pick two groups’ collaborative documents at random and “practice” grading them using the Rubric so you get a better feel for it.
  + Focus on the “Exemplary” mastery level (category) on each criterion before the other mastery levels (i.e., Accomplished, Developing, Beginning-Unsatisfactory) when evaluating and grading each group’s collaborative document. The Exemplary mastery level articulates the highest learning outcome.
* If the rubric doesn’t do what you want, adjust it, as needed. For example, modify mastery descriptions to add “context” for the collaborative document assignment, if needed. However, be careful to maintain a similar “weighting” of criteria (i.e., “content” should be a significantly higher weighting than the “mechanics” of the assignment). Also, be aware that the “points” assigned for each mastery level have been mathematically calculated and proportioned as follows: overall, Exemplary is ~ 90-100%; Accomplished is ~80-89%; Developing is ~ 70-79%; and Beginning-Unsatisfactory is ~ 0-69%.
* This Rubric will work with both “percentage-based” and “points-based” grading systems. For percentage-based grading systems, it is important that the overall points add up to 100 points to work properly with the Gradebook in the course management system (e.g., eCollege, Sakai, etc.).
* It is recommended that instructors include a “model” of an “Exemplary” collaborative document so students have a frame of reference before undertaking the assignment.