

Constraint Violations (check those violated. No penalty for first constraint violation; -0.5 for second and subsequent violations)

Must address one (1) foci for the Strand being analyzed
Must be between 500 and 700 words, and not exceed two (2) pages integrated text and graphics.
Must include the student’s name, word count, and which foci is being addressed at the top/start of the page.

Should be formatted with 11-point font, 1.1 spacing, and one-inch margins on standard letter-sized paper.
Must be submitted as a single PDF file through Quercus to the correct assignment.
Must have a file name that follows the Praxis naming convention.

| Characteristics of Evaluation | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Good | Outstanding |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Quality of introduction to frame the Strand analysis | The introduction (or lack) fails to establish the purpose, or leaves the reader to figure out the purpose and/or how the document is organized. | The introduction fulfills the PUBS functions and is relevant to analysis; however, it is vague, generic, or mostly restates the assignment. | The introduction is clear, relevant, and PUBS-complete; it provides the reader with a sense of how the author has framed, interpreted, or structured the analysis to follow. | <i>As per Good +</i> The introduction is concise and well balanced with respect to purpose, background, and structure. |
| Quality of analysis of strand focus | Experience is described factually but shows no evidence of interpereting the importance of events, steps, or processes; OR analysis is inconsistent, incoherent or overly confusing. | The interpretation of experience is explicit and contextualized according to one of the two foci; contextualization may be general or partial; evaluation of personal values, abilities, strengths, weaknesses, etc. is present but the implications are sometimes implicit or vague. | The interpretation of experience is reflective and focused on learning to do better engineering design or teamwork from a specific perspective; context is used for justification or qualifiers in claims; evaluation of values, abilities, strengths, weaknesses, etc. establishes the significance of actions taken. | <i>As per Good +</i> Claims are skillfully balanced with evidence and context of the experience; author thoughtfully connects design and team work and values, strengths, and biases. |
| Integration of evidence of actions with analysis | Evidence is missing, incomplete, irrelevant, or disconnected from the description of the framing strand. | Selected evidence is clearly connected to strand focus. Connections may be simplistic. Selection of evidence may lack variety or quantity (e.g. imbalance between what is claimed and what the evidence shows). | Selected evidence is detailed and varied enough to support reflection on engineering design and teamwork processes. | <i>As per Good +</i> Author explains how the evidence supports their claims about their actions in the framing strand. The evidence enables the reader to accept the author's claims. |
| Quality of assessment of individual actions to achieve the strand focus | Individual actions cannot be identified; author overly relies on the description of team behaviour, rather than individual action and experience. | Individual actions are presented to analyze experience but the role of the author is sometimes obscured with general language. Actions are sometimes trivial, or the author shows little insight about their actions. | Individual actions are non-trivial. Author describes the actions explicitly and explains their significance to their development as an engineering designer and team member, and to their team’s work. | <i>As per Good +</i> Individual actions are linked to team/project outcomes (good or bad). Significance of individual actions is detailed and well-understood. |
| Clarity of future action based on analysis | No future action is offered; or future action is disconnected from analysis. | Future action is straightforward, and likely to be helpful to team work, although it may be general in nature. | Future action is specific and shows insight into how the individual’s actions can impact team outcomes; action may involve taking new risk, trying new actions, or reinforcing positive behaviour. | <i>As per Good +</i> Future action shows consistency with and development in individual and team values |
| Clarity of written and visual expression | Visuals are missing, relegated to an appendix, illegible, or irrelevant to the purpose. Visuals lack captions. Language or syntax errors significantly detract from the readability and professionalism of the report. | Visuals are present (and captioned), but may not be well used in text. Visuals may be lacking in areas where they would greatly aid in a reader's understanding. Writing is readable, but may be repetitive or exhibit flourish over concision. | Visuals are referred to and integrated into the text. Choice of visuals improves understanding and clarity. Writing is clear and concise. Word choice is appropriate to the context. Coherence is maintained throughout paragraphs and arguments. | As per Good + Visuals guide the reader. Writing style and structure demonstrates understanding of the purpose and context through appropriate use of qualifiers in arguments, clear and concise expression, and precision in word choices. |