

Rubric Detail

Select [Grid View](#) or [List View](#) to change the rubric's layout. [More Help](#)

Name: **Rubric for Annotated references Assignment**

Exit

Grid View

[List View](#)

	No paper or paper submitted after class discussions	Very unsatisfactory – paper demonstrates little or no effort. Hence, there is little basis for evaluation.	Unsatisfactory – paper demonstrates inadequate effort in preparation for class. Ideas offered are seldom substantive, provide few, if any, insights, and do not provide a constructive direction for the class. Integrative arguments and effective comments are rarely presented. Ideas, at best, “cherry picking” efforts making isolated, obvious, or confusing points. Submissions arrived late and failed to meet established expectations.	Adequate - the paper demonstrates satisfactory effort in preparation for class. Ideas offered are sometimes substantive, provide generally useful insights, but seldom offer direction for the discussion. Arguments, when offered, are fairly well substantiated and are sometimes persuasive.	Good - the paper demonstrates thorough preparation. Ideas offered usually are substantive, provide good insights, and sometimes provide direction for the class discussions. Arguments, when offered, are generally well substantiated and are often persuasively presented.	Outstanding -the paper demonstrates exceptional preparation. Ideas offered are always substantive and provide one or more major insights as well as a direction for the group. Arguments, when offered, are well substantiated and persuasively presented.
Identify problems or issues	0 (0.00%) - 0 (0.00%) No issues or problems identified and no questions posed.	0.01 (0.01%) - 0.2 (0.20%) demonstrates little ability to identify issue/problem. Superficial statements are made without clarification or description or context. Superficial questions posed. Provides little evidence of effort reading the agreement and of reflection on that case study. Content is vague or fails to follow instructions for the assignment.	0.21 (0.21%) - 0.49 (0.49%) demonstrates a limited ability to identify issue/problem in a simple statement with little consideration of context. Most terms are undefined and most ambiguities unexplored. Simple questions posed. Provides limited evidence of effort reading the agreement and of reflection on that case study. Content is general and not responsive to instructions for the assignment.	0.5 (0.50%) - 0.7 (0.70%) demonstrates an adequate ability to identify issue/problem or some consideration of related context. Some terms are undefined and some ambiguities unexplored. Questions posed show some thought. Provides evidence of adequate careful reading of agreement and some reflection on that case study. Content responds to some but not all of the instructions for the assignment.	0.71 (0.71%) - 0.9 (0.90%) demonstrates a good ability to identify issue/problem with evidence of most relevant context without serious omissions of defined terms. Most ambiguities are explored and good questions posed. Provides evidence of careful reading of agreement and good reflection on that case study. Content responds to most of the details of tasks in the instructions to assignment.	0.91 (0.91%) - 1 (1.00%) Clearly identifies issue/problem with insight and evidence of consideration of all relevant context using well defined terms. Insightful questions posed. Provides evidence of very careful reading of agreement and excellent reflection on that case study. Content responds comprehensively with all tasks in the instructions for the assignment.
Research info/selecting and using info	0 (0.00%) - 0 (0.00%) No evidence of any research to investigate points of view or alternatives	0.77 (0.77%) - 15.4 (15.40%) provides little evidence of research to investigate alternative points of view.	16.17 (16.17%) - 37.73 (37.73%) provides limited evidence of research to identify limited references to investigate alternative points of view.	38.5 (38.50%) - 53.9 (53.90%) provides satisfactory evidence of adequate research to identify some references to investigate	54.67 (54.67%) - 69.3 (69.30%) provides good evidence of effort of research to identify good references to investigate alternative points	70.07 (70.07%) - 77 (77.00%) provides evidence of research all reasonably available references to investigate alternative points

			Information is taken from sources without interpretation or evaluation. Reasonably accessible resources like libraries are not used. Only online references are considered.	alternative points of view. Information is taken from sources with some interpretation or evaluation, but without high effort. Reasonably accessible resources like libraries are under used. Online resources are overemphasized.	of view. Information is taken from sources with evidence of good effort to interpret and evaluate relevance and applicability including evidence that most reasonably accessible resources were reviewed.	of view. Information is taken from sources with evidence of outstanding effort to interpret and evaluate relevance and applicability.
Integration of course concepts with text and context of agreements used as case studies	0 (0.00%) - 0 (0.00%) No integration of appropriate theories and concepts covered in class to interpret the agreements used as case studies.	0.01 (0.01%) - 0.2 (0.20%) Superficial integration of appropriate theories and concepts covered in class to interpret the agreements used as case studies.	0.21 (0.21%) - 0.49 (0.49%) Limited integration of appropriate theories and concepts covered in class to interpret the agreements used as case studies.	0.5 (0.50%) - 0.7 (0.70%) Integrates some appropriate theories and concepts covered in class to interpret the agreements used as case studies.	0.71 (0.71%) - 0.9 (0.90%) Integrates most appropriate theories and concepts covered in class to interpret the agreements used as case studies.	0.91 (0.91%) - 1 (1.00%) Integrates all appropriate theories and concepts covered in class to interpret the agreements used as case studies.
Propose alternative positions and rank/rate options with reasons	0 (0.00%) - 0 (0.00%) No critical evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of an alternative position in terms of costs, consequences, business priorities and risk analysis.	0.2 (0.20%) - 4 (4.00%) Superficial critical evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative positions in terms of costs, consequences, business priorities and risk analysis.	4.2 (4.20%) - 9.8 (9.80%) Limited critical evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative positions in terms of costs, consequences, business priorities and risk analysis.	10 (10.00%) - 14 (14.00%) Critically evaluates the advantages and disadvantages of some relevant alternative positions in terms of costs, consequences, business priorities and risk analysis.	14.2 (14.20%) - 18 (18.00%) Critically evaluates the advantages and disadvantages of most relevant alternative positions in terms of costs, consequences, business priorities and risk analysis.	18.2 (18.20%) - 20 (20.00%) Critically evaluates the advantages and disadvantages of all reasonably relevant alternative positions in terms of costs, consequences, business priorities and risk analysis.
Choose a negotiating position and justify	0 (0.00%) - 0 (0.00%) No meaningful conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) and no evaluation of priorities or consideration of opposing viewpoints.	0.01 (0.01%) - 0.2 (0.20%) Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) show little logic and evaluation of priorities and little consideration of opposing viewpoints.	0.21 (0.21%) - 0.49 (0.49%) Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) show poor logic and reflect inadequate evaluation of priorities and limited consideration of opposing viewpoints. Chooses a position that fails to consider relevant context and the interdependence of terms of the agreement. The position is simplistic and obvious without evidence of effort to create a meaningful synthesis.	0.5 (0.50%) - 0.7 (0.70%) Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are often logical and reflect adequate evaluation of priorities and some consideration of opposing viewpoints. Demonstrates an adequate consideration of the interdependence of terms of agreement. Synthesis adequately addresses different perspectives and is not trivial nor simple with some consideration of trade-offs.	0.71 (0.71%) - 0.9 (0.90%) Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are mostly logical and reflect informed evaluation of priorities and good consideration of opposing viewpoints. Demonstrates a good consideration of the interdependence of terms of agreement. Synthesis thoroughly addresses different perspectives and addresses a meaningful part of the agreement with some complex synthesis involving conflicting possibilities and trade-offs.	0.91 (0.91%) - 1 (1.00%) Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect informed evaluation of priorities and all due consideration of opposing viewpoints. Demonstrates an outstanding consideration of the interdependence of terms of agreement. Synthesis masterfully addresses different perspectives. Clearly explains conflicting positions and trade-offs of a complex part of the agreement.