

General Rubric for Service Learning Group Projects

Level 6

- All documents respond to client needs, missions and capabilities; all documents meet or exceed client's expectations
- All group members are actively engaged in most if not all aspects of the project and adequately document their participation (in project logs or by other means)
- Group uses a variety of research methods (primary and secondary) and observes ethical standards for conducting research
- Research is fully documented and employed to support or inform the project, documents, and recommendations
- Visuals are effectively presented and integrated with the content of the project and meet or exceed standards of professional presentation. Visuals are well suited to the purpose
- All documents are virtually free of grammatical or mechanical errors

Level 5

- All documents respond to client needs, missions, and capabilities; all documents meet or exceed client's expectations
- All group members are actively engaged in most if not all aspects of the project and adequately document their participation, noting any inconsistencies in participation
- Group uses a variety of research methods (primary and secondary) and observes ethical standards for conducting research
- The research is not fully documented and/or employed to support or inform the project, documents, and recommendations
- Visuals are effectively presented and integrated with the content of the project and meet or exceed standards of professional presentation, but they show some inconsistencies across the whole package. Visuals are well suited to the purpose
- Few, if any, grammatical or mechanical errors

Level 4

- All documents respond to client needs, missions, and capabilities; all documents basically satisfy client's expectations
- All groups members involved but not engaged. All group members attempt to document collaboration and do so more or less successfully
- Group uses a variety of research methods (primary and secondary) and observes ethical standards for conducting research
- Research not fully documented and ineffectively employed to support or inform the project, documents, and recommendations
- Visuals effectively presented but less integrated with content of project. Visuals meet standards of professional presentation but show some inconsistencies across the whole package. Visuals are well suited to the purpose
- A few minor grammatical or mechanical errors, but none interferes with clarity

Level 3

- All documents are minimally responsive to client needs, missions, and capabilities
- Group members had varying degrees of involvement and engagement, with some inconsistencies in documentation of the collaboration
- Group uses a variety of research methods (primary and secondary) and observes ethical standards in doing so.
- Research incompletely documented and insufficiently employed to support or inform the project, documents, and recommendations
- Visuals mostly effectively presented but less integrated with content of project; visuals meet standards of professional presentation but show some inconsistencies across the whole package. Visuals less well suited to purpose
- Errors in grammar and mechanics distract the reader from the content and continuity

Level 2

- All documents minimally or not responsive to client needs, missions, and capabilities
- Group members had varying levels of involvement with some students failing to participate in collaborative work
- Lack of variety in research methods and questionable research ethics
- Visuals not effectively presented and lack integration with content of project and don't meet professional standards, showing many inconsistencies. Visuals not well suited to the purpose
- Numerous errors in grammar and mechanics

Level 1

- Documents are not responsive to client needs, missions, and capabilities and fail to meet client's expectations
- Group did not work together well; one person does most of the work; poor documentation of the collaboration
- Major components of research were not completed or incorporated into the project, documents, and recommendations
- No visuals incorporated or integrated. Overall lack of professionalism, perhaps with plagiarized or degraded images
- Numerous errors in grammar and mechanics.

— Developed by PW Instructors in 505M, Fall 2007