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 |