Team Assignment #1: Project Problem Description Rubric (JZ W23)

Activity: Assignment #1: Team Project Problem Description
Course: Engineering Technical Communications (Section 4)
Name: Amey Mahendra Thakur

Criteria	Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Criterion Score
Content: "A" descriptions exhibit substantial understanding of a problem. Excellent documents thoroughly relate a problem's complexities and context, and fully explain why the problem needs immediate attention. The topic is covered in sufficient depth.	0 points Document contains little or no context or argument.	1 point Problem is ill-defined or falls outside assignment's scope. ✔	2 points Nature or scope of problem not yet fully determined; scope of topic may need adjustment	3 points Overview of the problem is generally sound; some likely questions are not fully addressed.	4 points Problem is well defined and its contexts are detailed authoritatively.	1 / 4

Criterion Feedback

Geographical scope missing: Remember, you were asked to limit your scope/focus by narrowing your study to a specific geographical region. At present, the problem here needs to be better defined and limited in scope. You have discussed the concept of a geographical scope, but you have not actually chosen one.

Generalization: This paper, at this stage, contains broad, sweeping statements and generalizations. In formal technical writing, it is important to support your claims with specific, empirical evidence. Avoid making grand statements, assumptions, and generalizations.

At this stage, this report is very light on specific details. This assignment spends a lot of its length describing the sustainable development goals in general terms and broadly explaining the function of home insulation without making concrete, direct claims about any specific type of home insulation material.

Criteria	Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Criterion Score
Audience Accommodation: "A" descriptions appeal to an audience's values and priorities (pathos), use research and reasoning (logos), and provide precise, vivid definitions and descriptions. Readers will be convinced that a problem exists and is serious	0 points Basic errors seriously compromise team's credibility.	1 point Little evidence present of problem's existence or seriousness.	2 points Document inconsistently appeals to audience, and/or is variably accommodating in word choice.	3 points One identifiable problem or omission in ethos, pathos, logos, or exigence exists. ✔	4 points Document targets likely audiences with explicit, identifiable appeals in all areas.	3 / 4

Criterion Feedback

- **Acronyms:** Be sure to always introduce technical acronyms by writing out the full term the first time it is used. Include the acronym in brackets, and include *only* the acronym from this point forward. Be sure to introduce ALL acronyms.

Criteria	Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Criterion Score
Audience Accommodation: "A" descriptions appeal to an audience's values and	0 points Basic errors seriously compromise team's credibility.	1 point Little evidence present of problem's	2 points Document inconsistently appeals to audience, and/or is variably	3 points One identifiable problem or omission in	4 points Document targets likely audiences with explicit, identifiable	

Criteria	Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Criterion Score
Organization and Coherence: "A" descriptions are divided into clear and logical sections; the rationale for arrangement is clear. Content is easy to find, and redundancy among sections is minimal. Detailed headings and subheadings provide a sound under	0 points Underdeveloped: missing sections show omission of crucial content.	1 point Document is not yet divided into logical, intuitive sections and paragraphs; headings missing.	2 points Headings are unclear; sequence of content sometimes difficult to follow. ✔	3 points Document is arranged clearly and requires only expansion of headings or work on transitions.	4 points Thorough headings reflect content clearly; audiences can easily locate information.	2 / 4

Criterion Feedback

- **Original title is inappropriate:** This document does not contain a strong, unique title. Remember, a title is your first attempt to connect with your audience and describe the contents and purpose of your document. This is a significant organizational element of any piece of technical writing.
- **Paragraphs:** Be sure to divide your work into logically organized, appropriately formatted technical paragraphs, as discussed in class. All paragraphs should have *appropriate topic sentences* that announce the paragraphs' contents accurately. Paragraphs should be coherent, such that they do not contain sentences unrelated to the topic sentence.

Criteria	Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Criterion Score
Professionalism, Grammar, and Style: "A" descriptions persuade readers of the team's sincerity, professionalism, and overall ability to communicate effectively. They are free of grammatical errors, and the prose is efficient and concise, avoiding unnec	0 points Document fails to met basic professional standards.	1 point Document contains frequent errors and miscues; multiple authorship is evident.	2 points Occasional errors and inefficiency show need for revision and proofreading.	3 points Minimal errors attest to care and professionalism; voice is unified. ✓	4 points Document is error-free, information-dense, and easy to read.	3 / 4

Criterion Feedback

This paper contains a fair number of mechanical and grammatical writing errors. Individually, many of these issues are relatively minor, but they collectively add up to affect the perceived credibility of this piece of writing.

Concision: This report contains several "wordy," "overwritten," or unnecessarily complicated sentences. Please see my notes throughout, and remember that clear, direct, concise writing makes for the most effective technical communication.

Criteria	Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Criterion Score
Research and Citation: "A" descriptions move the team toward comprehensive, credible knowledge of the topic to be investigated. Research meets professional standards, drawing from scholarly materials as well as general-audience sources, and IEEE format	0 points Document lacks References list and in-text citations.	1 point Citations are generally faulty or are limited to one or two popular sources.	2 points Questions arise about the value or expertise of sources used; frequent errors in IEEE format.	3 points Both scholarly and local research are evident; some claims not yet fully supported by evidence. ✔	4 points Document shows serious engagement with scholarly documents and local experts.	3 / 4

Criterion Feedback

References page contains some errors, but this project is generally very well researched.

| Originality and Paraphrasing: "A" level descriptions present original content, and the synthesis of existing literature is well executed, and proper paraphrasing techniques are used throughout. | 0 points

Sources are improperly quoted or paraphrased.

✔ | 1 point

Document demonstrates lack of original analysis and interpretation and use of quotations instead of paraphrasing. | 2 points

Document demonstrates lack of original analysis and interpretation or use of quotations instead of paraphrasing. | 3 points

Document contains some original content, but replies heavily on paraphrasing of secondary sources. | 4 points

Majority of material is original content supported by properly paraphrased secondary sources. | 0 / 4 |

Criterion Feedback

Criteria	Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Criterion Score
Document contains instances of insufficient, inappropriate, or missing paraphrase. This is a significant issue. See sections underlined in green on the page.						

Total	12 / 24

Overall Score

Insufficient	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory ✔	Good	Excellent