

Rubric for Production of e-text Chapter (Christian Auclair / Psychology)

	18-20	15-17	11-14	<10
EDITING (20%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Free of grammatical errors / spelling mistakes -Sentences are well structured and express concepts with clarity, coherence, completeness and brevity when called for -Editing reflects planning / peer review by a strong reader or writer / feedback and subsequent revision -Excellent use of psychological language (terminology) -Publishable as is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Generally flawless though some minor instances of grammar or spelling could be addressed -Concepts clearly expressed. Though some passages could use further elaboration or conversely, brevity -Coherence of ideas generally good though editorial feedback would encourage some revision -Editing reflects planning / review / revision but some aspects of process need further attention -Publishable with some minor revisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Spelling & grammar mistakes occur too frequently (possibly 1 per page). -There are instances where some concepts are vague and require obvious revisions -Coherence of ideas inconsistent. In some instances, sub-topics may be missing or movement from one subject to another seems disconnected. -Major edits needed / not publishable -Writing process not in evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Spelling / grammar mistakes too frequent (sometimes more than 1 or 2 per page) -Concepts not clear / confusing / or misleading -Coherence of topics is lacking -Comes of as a quick first draft written without one's full attention / effort -Writing process does not appear to have been followed. Planning appears to be weak and obvious flaws suggest very little feedback/revision, if any.
RESEARCH (20%)	<p>Each page is loaded with links within the text that are appropriately associated with important concepts that are not necessarily the main focus of the chapter (e.g., your chapter is on <i>French New Wave</i>, but you allude to <i>Italian Neo-realism</i>. So you link neo-realism to an expert source). This could also include key definitions.</p> <p>Each page includes highly relevant links to 'key' concepts pertaining to the main focus of the chapter (within text and with more info)</p> <p>Bibliography / Reference section provides links to the expert, scholarly sources relating to the core topics.</p>	<p>Most pages (%) includes links embedded within the text for some important concepts that are not part of the main focus. However, some areas that could use sourcing were missed. Or, some of the links may have been to weak sources or lacking depth/relevance.</p> <p>More than % of pages include links to 'key' concepts pertaining to the chapter topic. Sources are good/relevant</p> <p>Reference section contains links to sources though relevance/ scholarly nature at times needs to be improved</p>	<p>Most pages(½ to %) include embedded links for important concepts that are not part of the chapter's main focus. The depth or relevance of those links could be improved in many instances. Obvious opportunities to provide links were missed.</p> <p>½ to % of pages include links to 'key' concepts pertaining to the chapter topic. Sources are generally good though the depth of some sources could be improved.</p> <p>Reference section needs improvement</p>	<p>Most pages are missing embedded links for important concepts that are not part of the chapter's main focus. The depth or relevance of those links need to be improved.</p> <p>Most pages do not include links to 'key' concepts pertaining to the chapter topic. The depth or relevance of those links need to be improved.</p> <p>Reference section missing or bare minimum was cited</p>
TOPIC SELECTION / SUBJECT KNOWLEDGE (20%)	<p>Selected topics cover a significant range of AP topics in outline. (targets surpassed)</p> <p>Topic was above average in terms of complexity.</p> <p>Content was clear and extensive in its coverage of main points as well as important details.</p> <p>Content was organized, clear, elaboration, and succinctly & effectively explained topics with clarity</p>	<p>Student has selected compelling topics that are important but generic / sub-topics cover basics. Targets met.</p> <p>Content covered the essentials and at times provided additional depth or insight.</p> <p>Content was organized and fairly clear. Information could have been more succinct. Info as generally clear.</p>	<p>Topic selection was somewhat generic and needed more depth. Slightly short of targets in sign-up sheet.</p> <p>Content touched upon most of the topics and provided fair explanations. Though depth lacking or at times, important points missing.</p> <p>Content could use more structure and organization. Information was not always clear. Confusing or misleading at times.</p>	<p>The student selected generic topics and skimmed the surface somewhat. Depth was lacking.</p> <p>Content alluded to topic info or was missing at times. Very brief, almost bullet like explanations provided.</p> <p>Lacks structure and organization. Many points were confusing, misleading, absent or wrong.</p>

<p>MEDIA ENRICHMENT (20%)</p>	<p>-All media elements are included for each topic / slide (e.g. timed video clips, images, poignant text, sound, quiz) that reinforce succinct text for every new concept.</p> <p>-Includes links to expert websites -- Ted talks, etc "Additional Info"-- that are user friendly sources. -Automated quiz was excellent.</p>	<p>-Includes a variety of media that reinforce text in most but not all situations. OR, may not always be optimal.</p> <p>-Link provided to a generic reference. Some good video links.</p> <p>Automated quiz included though questions/answers could be more polished</p>	<p>Includes media though many opportunities missed or relevance was not optimal. Link lacks depth. Quiz lacks refinement or is too short.</p>	<p>Very limited media/or missing . Too simplistic or inaccurate</p> <p>Media elements are scattered. Requires clarity / relevance.</p> <p>No link provided. No quiz included</p>
<p>ORGANIZATION & LAYOUT (15%)</p> <p>Peer Editing (5%)</p>	<p>-The arrangement of elements is organized, cohesive and professional looking -Citations list provide -Table of contents with slide links provided</p> <p>-established a peer editing partnership. -Thoroughly peer edited partner's word with commentary where needed -ensured their own chapter was thoroughly peer edited</p>	<p>The layout is generally good though some minor symmetry issues can be improved</p> <p>-had someone review their written work and acted on obvious suggestions</p> <p>-provided general peer editing commentary to another</p>	<p>The layout lacks consistency at times. Enhancements still needed</p> <p>-had someone review their work though many errors were evident after submission</p> <p>-review of another's chapter was too basic. Too many errors in grammar or conceptual clarity remained</p>	<p>The layout is inconsistent with the global look of the book.</p> <p>-Did not have their work peer edited</p> <p>-Did not review the chapter of other students.</p>