Final Project Rubric

Category	F (Fail)	D (Below Average Work)	C (Average Work)	B (Excellent Work)	A (Superior Work)
Clarity and Structure of Project Report (Group)	The project report is incomplete or lacks structure.	The project report is not clear, concise, or well-structured. It lacks flow.	The project report is somewhat clear, but structure or flow may be lacking in some parts.	The project report is clear, concise, and mostly well-structured, with good flow.	The project report is extremely clear, concise, well-structured, and flows excellently.
Grammar and Sentence Structure of Project Report (Group)	No project report submitted, or grammar errors make it unreadable.	Multiple grammar mistakes make the project report difficult to understand.	Several grammar mistakes, but the project report is still readable.	One or two grammar mistakes, but they do not significantly impair readability.	No spelling or grammar mistakes. Writing is professional and easy to read.
Quality of Project Description in Project Report (Group)	The project report does not address the topic or is completely off-topic.	The project report has little detail or is not appropriately focused on the goals.	The project report describes the topic, but details may be vague or incomplete.	The project report gives a clear and detailed description of the topic.	The project report provides a comprehensive, detailed, and well-thought-out description.
Project Description Connection to Social or Economic Issues (Group)	The project report does not address any social or economic issues related to the topic.	The project report mentions social or economic issues but does not clearly connect them to the topic.	The project report touches on social or economic issues, but the connection to the topic is vague.	The project report makes clear connections between social or economic issues and the topic.	The project report makes insightful connections to relevant social or economic issues, strengthening the topic.
Achievement of Goals and Adherence to Timeline (Group)	No timeline or goals are addressed, or they are completely unachieved.	The project report shows minimal adherence to the timeline and goals set out in the proposal, with no explanation for deviations.	The project report addresses some goals, but many are not fully achieved or aligned with the timeline; minimal or vague explanation for deviations provided.	The project report shows strong adherence to the timeline, with most goals met as proposed; reasonable explanations are provided for any minor deviations.	The project report shows excellent adherence to the timeline, with all goals fully achieved as proposed; any significant deviations are explained thoroughly and justified.
Individual Contributions and Responsibilities	No contributions from group	Responsibilities are minimally fulfilled, with	Some group members fulfill their	Most group members fulfill their	All group members fulfill their responsibilities

Category	F (Fail)	D (Below Average Work)	C (Average Work)	B (Excellent Work)	A (Superior Work)
(Individual)	members are identified, or responsibilities are unfulfilled.	little contribution from group members and no explanation for deviations from proposed roles.	responsibilities, but contributions may be incomplete or deviate from the proposal, with limited explanation provided.	responsibilities, with contributions closely aligning with the proposal; minor deviations are explained and justified.	thoroughly, with contributions fully aligned with the proposal; any significant deviations are thoroughly explained and justified.
Autoethnography Connects Meaningfully with Course Readings (Individual)	No meaningful connection to course readings, 1 or fewer references.	Minimal connection to course readings, references only 2.	Basic connection to course readings, references 3.	Clear connection to course readings, references 4.	Insightful, meaningful connection to course readings, references 5 or more.
Quality of Meaningful Connections with Course Readings (Individual)	Connections lack relevance or do not support understanding of the topic.	Superficial connections; readings do not contribute to critical understanding.	Basic connections to readings; enhances understanding somewhat but lacks depth.	Thoughtful connections to readings that support understanding of the topic.	Deep, insightful connections to readings that critically enhance understanding of the topic.
Citations for Literature Review ONLY	Fewer than 8 reliable, credible references.	8–11 reliable, credible references, but lacks depth or relevance.	12–15 reliable, credible references with some relevant insights.	16–19 reliable, credible references with thoughtful integration.	20 or more reliable, credible references with comprehensive integration and insight.
Meaningful Engagement for Community-Campus Engagement Project ONLY	No engagement, 0 hours per week.	Minimal engagement, around 0.5 hours per week.	Basic engagement, around 1 hour per week.	Consistent engagement, around 2 hours per week.	Strong engagement, around 2.5 hours per week.