

Grading Rubric for GitHub

Spring 2016 CEE 6490

Names: Prasanna dahal, Ryan James

Category (Possible Score)	No Evidence	Does not Meet Standard	Nearly Meets Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Self- Score	Instructor Score
Title (2)	Absent 0	Evidence of one. 0	Evidence of two. 1	Evidence of three. 1	River basin name, author names, and contact info for authors. Neatly finished with no errors. 2	2	
Introduction (10)	Absent, no evidence 0	There is no clear introduction, main topic, or outline of content. 1 - 5	The introduction is either: 1. Too sketchy. Gives an inadequate overview, Or: 2. Too detailed, info later repeated 6 - 7	The introduction overviews the group project and previews the wiki page(s) structure 8	The introduction overviews the river basin, work done through the group project, and organization of the wiki page(s). An effective summary. Gives enough detail to interest the reader. 9 - 10	10	
Technical Content (38)	No content provided or analysis evident. 0 - 19	Little content provided. The reader has no idea about the water management problems in the basin or what was done for the group project. 20 - 25	Sketchy: may have left out 2 or more content areas; little reference to prior work; or no tables, figures, or pictures presented. 26 - 30	Wiki lacks adequate detail, but content for 6 of the 7 areas is provided and includes one or more tables, figures, or pictures. Most prior work referenced and hyperlinked. 31 - 34	Provides basin background information and describes problem(s), management objective(s), performance indicator(s), management alternatives, method(s) used to evaluate alternatives against the stated performance indicator(s), and results. Uses tables, figures, and pictures to illustrate the above. Prior work referred to through references and hyperlinks. 35 - 38	38	
Organization and Development (10)	No evidence of structure. 0	Little evidence of structure or organization. 2 - 5	Organization of ideas not fully developed. Two or more pages, sections, or subsections missing or out of order. 6 - 7	Sub-pages, sections, subsections, and/or lists present, but their use not perfected. 8	Logical sequencing of ideas. Uses sub-pages, sections, sub-sections, and/or lists to order, present, and develop ideas. In each section, one or more paragraphs develop each idea. 9 - 10	10	

Grading Rubric for GitHub
Spring 2016 CEE 6490

Names: Prasanna dahal, Ryan James

Category (Possible Score)	No Evidence	Does not Meet Standard	Nearly Meets Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard	Self- Score	Instructor Score
Word Usage and Format (15)	Not applicable	Many, distracting errors in grammar, spelling, sentence structure, word usage, significant figures, tables, and figures. Unacceptable at the graduate level. 1-8	With some grammatical errors. Figures are too small and/or under-labeled, although they are usually of acceptable quality and focus. Incoherent tables. Inconsistent fonts and headings. Could be improved by being more meticulous. 9 – 11	Almost no errors in punctuation, capitalization, spelling, sentence structure, word usage, significant figures, and presentation of figures and tables. No broken hyperlinks. 12 – 13	Punctuation, capitalization, spelling, sentence structure, word usage, and significant figures all correct. Clear, consistent fonts and headings. Good wiki processing skills. Figures and tables presented in correct format. No broken or empty hyperlinks. 14 - 15	15	
Conclusions (10)	Absent 0	Incomplete and/or not focused. 4 - 6	The conclusion does not adequately restate the main findings. 7	The conclusion restates the main findings. 8	Effectively restates the main findings and benefit to the reader. 9 - 10	10	
Hyperlinks and References (5)	Absent 0	With many errors or only hyperlink provided. 1 – 2	With some errors and only 2 hyperlinks provided. 3	With few errors, at least 3 hyperlinks to content outside the USU domain 4	All citations and references listed in ASCE format with no errors. Include at least 4 hyperlinks to content or work outside the USU domain. 5	5	
Group Participation (10)	Not applicable.	Wiki page(s) appear to be t work of only o group membe 4 - 6	One or more group members disproportionately author content 7	All group members author content. 8	All group members significantly contribute to author content as reflected by use logs on History page(s). 9 - 10	10	
TOTAL (100)						100	