# Experiential Learning Reflection – Evaluation Rubric

| Category | F (Fail) | D (Below Average) | C (Average) | B (Excellent) | A (Superior) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Description of Volunteer Experience** | No description provided or completely inaccurate. | Very vague or incomplete description; tasks, goals, or context unclear. | Basic description of placement and tasks; some details missing. | Clear, detailed description of where the student volunteered, the initiative's goals, and their activities. | Rich, precise, and engaging description that contextualizes the initiative within broader food system goals. |
| **Critical Self-Reflection (Personal Insight)** | No reflection or entirely irrelevant. | Minimal reflection; little insight into personal assumptions, expectations, or learning. | Some reflection present; personal insights are limited or uneven. | Strong reflection showing meaningful engagement with expectations, challenges, or changes in perspective. | Exceptional self-reflection that demonstrates deep personal insight, critical awareness, and thoughtful engagement with the experience. |
| **Analysis of Urban Agriculture Practice** | No analysis or completely off-topic. | Very limited analysis; misunderstandings of key issues (skills, community dynamics, labour, governance, etc.). | Basic analysis that identifies some issues but lacks depth or nuance. | Strong analysis that draws clear connections between experience and the realities of urban agriculture practice. | Outstanding, nuanced analysis that synthesizes multiple dimensions (social, political, ecological, governance, equity). |
| **Integration of Course Readings (Minimum 4 Required)** | No course readings used. | Only 1–2 readings used or connections extremely weak. | Three readings used OR four used with superficial connections. | At least four readings used with clear, meaningful integration into the reflection. | Four or more readings used with excellent synthesis; concepts are applied insightfully and critically to the experience. |
| **Use of Appropriate Sources** *(Course readings only — no external sources)* | No sources used or external sources used against instructions. | Course readings used inaccurately or minimally. | Course readings used but with limited understanding. | Course readings used accurately and appropriately to support ideas. | Course readings used with depth, precision, and strong conceptual understanding. |
| **Insight Into Broader Urban Agriculture Systems** | No broader insights or misconceptions. | Weak or fragmented insights; limited understanding of bigger-picture issues. | Some broader insights, though may be basic or incomplete. | Well-developed insights into systemic issues (food sovereignty, community development, equity, sustainability). | Sophisticated and original insights connecting the experience to systemic challenges and possibilities for transforming food systems. |

| Category | F (Fail) | D (Below Average) | C (Average) | B (Excellent) | A (Superior) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Clarity and Structure** | Writing is disorganized, unclear, or incomplete. | Writing is often unclear or unfocused; poor flow or missing sections. | Some organizational structure; clarity varies; ideas partially developed. | Clear, organized, and well-structured reflection with logical flow. | Highly polished, engaging, and well-organized writing; excellent coherence throughout. |
| **Grammar and Mechanics** | Major errors that prevent understanding. | Frequent errors that disrupt flow or clarity. | Noticeable errors but generally readable. | Minor errors that do not impede readability. | Virtually no errors; writing is clean, fluid, and professional. |
| **Word Count (600–800 words)** | Fewer than 400 words or more than 1000 words. | 401–499 words or 801–900 words. | 500–549 words or 901–950 words. | 550–599 words or 951–999 words. | **600–800 words (within assigned range).** |