

## University English I (UCLC1008) Rubric-based Assessment

### Grade Conversion Table for:

- Reflective Learning Portfolio (10%)
- Academic Writing Quiz (15%)
- Argument Construction & Evaluation (Draft) (15%)
- Argument Construction & Evaluation (Final) (20%)
- Critical Response to Academic Arguments (20%)

Grade	Percentage	10% Weighting	15% Weighting	20% Weighting
<b>A</b>	<b>85% or above</b>	<b>8.5% or above</b>	<b>12.8% or above</b>	<b>17% or above</b>
<b>A-</b>	<b>80-84%</b>	<b>8%-8.4%</b>	<b>12%-12.7%</b>	<b>16%-16.8%</b>
<b>B+</b>	<b>75-79%</b>	<b>7.5%-7.9%</b>	<b>11.3%-11.9%</b>	<b>15%-15.8%</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>70-74%</b>	<b>7%-7.4%</b>	<b>10.5%-11.2%</b>	<b>14%-14.8%</b>
<b>B-</b>	<b>65-69%</b>	<b>6.5%-6.9%</b>	<b>9.8%-10.4%</b>	<b>13%-13.8%</b>
<b>C+</b>	<b>60-64%</b>	<b>6%-6.4%</b>	<b>9%-9.7%</b>	<b>12%-12.8%</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>55-59%</b>	<b>5.5%-5.9%</b>	<b>8.3%-8.9%</b>	<b>11%-11.8%</b>
<b>C-</b>	<b>50-54%</b>	<b>5%-5.4%</b>	<b>7.5%-8.2%</b>	<b>10%-10.8%</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>45-49%</b>	<b>4.5%-4.9%</b>	<b>6.8%-7.4%</b>	<b>9%-9.8%</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>44% or below</b>	<b>4.4% or below</b>	<b>6.7% or below</b>	<b>8.9% or below</b>

### Notes:

#### 1. Changes to be made in the rubrics include:

1.1 Splitting “D or below” into “D (Marginal Pass)” and “F (Fail)” for all assignments

1.2 Assessing paraphrasing or handling the extent of copying texts from the given sources in AWQ and ACE Draft

2. Substantial changes have been made to the ACE Final rubric.

## Academic Writing Quiz - 15%

Total: \_\_\_\_ / 100% x 0.15 = \_\_\_\_ / 15%

Criteria	A / A- (16 or above)				B+ / B / B- (13-15)			C+ / C / C- (10-12)			D or below (9 or below)			
<b>Summary Accuracy (20%)</b>  <i>Coverage of Main Ideas, Precision and Avoidance of Misinterpretation</i>	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes all the main ideas from the original text without omission</li> <li>Free from personal bias or unsupported claims</li> <li>No distortion, exaggeration, or oversimplification of the original meaning of main ideas</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Captures most of the main ideas</li> <li>No personal views are included</li> <li>May include some unnecessary details</li> <li>May contain minor inaccuracies only in wording or emphasis but no major misinterpretation of main ideas</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Omits multiple main ideas</li> <li>May occasionally include personal views</li> <li>Includes some unnecessary details</li> <li>Includes irrelevant details or unsupported claims</li> <li>Contains some inaccuracies resulting in misinterpretation or distortion of the original meaning of main ideas</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Makes significant omissions or misinterprets main ideas</li> <li>Includes irrelevant details</li> <li>May fabricate claims not present in the source</li> </ul>			
<b>Synthesis (20%)</b>  <i>Connection of Main Ideas and Relationships Among Ideas</i>	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectively integrates main ideas from both excerpts to address the topic</li> <li>Shows a clear logical relationship between ideas (e.g. comparison, contrast)</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrates main ideas from both excerpts but with some minor gaps or oversights in addressing the topic</li> <li>Shows a basic logical relationship (e.g., comparison/contrast) but may be mechanical</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attempts to integrate main ideas but unable to do so meaningfully</li> <li>May overly focus on one excerpt</li> <li>Identifies a relationship (e.g., similarity/difference) but it lacks clarity or a logical development of ideas</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little to no meaningful connection drawn between excerpts</li> <li>Fails to establish a discernible relationship among ideas</li> <li>May ignore one source or present ideas disjointedly</li> <li>Ideas are listed without analysis or comparison</li> </ul>			
<b>Paraphrasing (20%)</b>  <i>Originality of Wording and Preservation of Meaning</i>	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fully reworded in the student's own voice, with no direct copying of phrases or sentence structures</li> <li>Accurately conveys the original idea without distortion or</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mostly students' own original phrasing</li> <li>Meaning is generally correct</li> <li>May contain near-identical sentence structures from the source</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relies on the source's phrasing and sentence structures</li> <li>May distort or oversimplify the original ideas</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Direct copying of phrases, sentences, or entire passages with no meaningful rewording</li> <li>Meaning may or may not be preserved</li> </ul>			

	oversimplification of meaning				May lose nuance or include minor inaccuracies in meaning									
	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	
<b>Academic Tone &amp; Clarity (20%)</b>  <i>Formality, Clarity, Flow of Ideas and Cohesion</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formal tone with no informal language (e.g., contractions, colloquialisms, or conversational phrasing)</li> <li>Sentences are clear, logically structured, and free of ambiguity</li> <li>Smooth transitions between ideas with no awkward phrasing</li> <li>Provides a well-structured summary with a clear thesis statement in the introduction, an effective topic sentence for each body paragraph, and a relevant conclusion</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Predominantly formal but may include some lapses (e.g., a contraction, slightly informal word choice)</li> <li>Sentences are generally logically structured</li> <li>Some transitions may be abrupt or mechanical</li> <li>Thesis statement is present but may be imprecise</li> <li>Topic sentences are clear but may not fully align with the thesis or lack development</li> <li>Conclusion summarises a few points only</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Frequent use of informal phrasing (e.g. conversational language, slang, or overuse of first-person pronouns)</li> <li>Ideas may be hard to follow as sentences lack logical connections</li> <li>Awkward or disjointed transitions are evident</li> <li>Thesis statement is vague or off-topic</li> <li>Topic sentences are weak or disconnected from the thesis</li> <li>Conclusion is repetitive or does not summarise key points</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overly casual, inappropriate for academic writing (e.g. text-message style, excessive slang)</li> <li>Ideas are consistently unclear or confusing due to absence of logical structure</li> <li>Ideas are disjointed due to absence of transitions</li> <li>Thesis statement is missing or incoherent</li> <li>Topic sentences are absent or unrelated to the excerpts</li> <li>Conclusion is missing or does not address the topic</li> </ul>			
<b>In-text Citations (20%)</b>  <i>APA Referencing Style</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correct use of signal phrases and quotations</li> <li>No missing or misplaced citations</li> <li>All secondary citations, if any, are correctly cited</li> <li>Fully follows the APA referencing style</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May occasionally forget page numbers, or quotation marks for direct quotes</li> <li>Most sources are correctly cited</li> <li>Some secondary citations, if any, are correctly cited</li> <li>Minor errors in APA referencing style (e.g., missing parentheses, incorrect punctuation)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No citations for direct quotations</li> <li>Citations are missing in most cited sources</li> <li>Secondary citations, if any, are missing or incorrectly cited</li> <li>Frequent errors in APA referencing style (e.g., missing years, incorrect author order)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No citations for direct quotations</li> <li>Citations are rarely seen or absent</li> <li>Citations, if any, do not follow the APA referencing style or may be fabricated</li> </ul>			

## Argument Construction and Evaluation (Draft) - 15%

Total: \_\_\_\_ / 100% x 0.15 = \_\_\_\_ / 15%

Criteria	A / A- (24 or above)					B+ / B / B- (20-23)				C+ / C / C- (15-19)					D or below (14 or below)			
<b>Critical Thinking &amp; Use of Grounds (30%)</b>  <i>Quality of Rebuttal (Counterargument + Response) and Grounds</i>	28	27	26	25	24	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response successfully addresses the counterargument</li> <li>Grounds are highly effective in supporting the claim</li> </ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response addresses the counterargument</li> <li>Grounds are generally effective in supporting the claim</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response attempts to address the counterargument</li> <li>Grounds are sometimes effective in supporting the claim</li> </ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response does not address the counterargument or is not attempted</li> <li>Minimal grounds used</li> </ul>			
<b>Argument Structure (30%)</b>  <i>Argumentation Model Adherence &amp; Logical Interconnectedness of Components</i>	28	27	26	25	24	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All model components are appropriately applied</li> <li>All model components are logically connected</li> </ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1–2 components are inappropriately applied</li> <li>1-2 components are not fully connected (e.g., weak warrant in Toulmin)</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 or more components are inappropriately applied</li> <li>2-3 or more components are not connected</li> </ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Missing multiple components</li> <li>Components presented, if any, are poorly or not connected</li> </ul>			
<b>Academic Tone &amp; Clarity (30%)</b>  <i>Tone, Flow, Precision</i>	28	27	26	25	24	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formal tone with no informal language (e.g., contractions, colloquialisms, or conversational phrasing)</li> <li>Sentences are clear, logically structured, and free of ambiguity</li> <li>Smooth transitions between ideas with no awkward phrasing</li> <li>Provides a well-structured paper with a clear thesis statement in the introduction, and an effective topic sentence for each body paragraph</li> </ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Predominantly formal but may include some lapses (e.g., a contraction, slightly informal word choice)</li> <li>Sentences are generally logically structured</li> <li>Some transitions may be abrupt or mechanical</li> <li>Thesis statement is present but may be imprecise</li> <li>Topic sentences are clear but may not fully align with the thesis or lack development</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Frequent use of informal phrasing (e.g. conversational language, slang, or overuse of first-person pronouns)</li> <li>Ideas may be hard to follow as sentences lack logical connections</li> <li>Awkward or disjointed transitions are evident</li> <li>Thesis statement is vague or off-topic</li> <li>Topic sentences are weak or disconnected from the thesis</li> </ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overly casual, inappropriate for academic writing (e.g. text-message style, excessive slang)</li> <li>Ideas are consistently unclear or confusing due to absence of logical structure</li> <li>Ideas are disjointed due to absence of transitions</li> <li>Thesis statement is missing or incoherent</li> <li>Topic sentences are absent or unrelated to the thesis</li> </ul>			

Criteria	A / A- (8 or above)			B+ / B / B- (6.5-7.5)			C+ / C / C- (5.0-6.0)			D or below (4.5 or below)			
<b>Citations &amp; References (10%)</b>	9	8.5	8	7.5	7	6.5	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4	3.5	
<i>APA Referencing Style</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correct use of signal phrases and quotations</li> <li>No missing or misplaced citations</li> <li>All secondary citations, if any, are correctly cited</li> <li>Fully follows the APA referencing style</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May occasionally forget page numbers, or quotation marks for direct quotes</li> <li>Most sources are correctly cited</li> <li>Some secondary citations, if any, are correctly cited</li> <li>Minor errors in APA referencing style (e.g., missing parentheses, incorrect punctuation)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No citations for direct quotations</li> <li>Citations are missing in most cited sources</li> <li>Secondary citations, if any, are missing or incorrectly cited</li> <li>Frequent errors in APA referencing style (e.g., missing years, incorrect author order)</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No citations for direct quotations</li> <li>Citations are rarely seen or absent</li> <li>Citations, if any, do not follow the APA referencing style or may be fabricated</li> </ul>			

## Argument Construction and Evaluation (Final) - 20%

Total: \_\_\_\_ / 100% x 0.2 = \_\_\_\_ / 20%

Criteria	A / A- (32 or above)	B+ / B / B- (26-31)	C+ / C / C- (20-25)	D (18-19)	F (17 or below)
<b>Critical Thinking &amp; Use of Grounds (40%)</b>  <i>Quality of Claims, Rebuttal (Counterargument + Response) &amp; Grounds</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claims are clear, debatable, and well-articulated</li> <li>Counterarguments thoroughly address the core idea of the claims</li> <li>Responses successfully address the counterarguments</li> <li>Grounds are highly effective, relevant, and sufficient in supporting claims, counterarguments and responses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claims are clear but may lack depth or specificity</li> <li>Counterarguments address the core idea of the claims but may be superficial</li> <li>Responses address the counterarguments but may be superficial</li> <li>Grounds are generally effective but may lack variety or depth in supporting claims, counterarguments and responses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claims are vague or overly simplistic</li> <li>Counterarguments attempt to address the claims but are poorly structured</li> <li>Responses attempt to address the counterarguments but are poorly structured</li> <li>Grounds are limited, weak or insufficiently developed in supporting claims, counterarguments and responses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claims are weak or may be unclear or overly broad</li> <li>Counterarguments are little relevant to the claims</li> <li>Responses are little relevant to the counterarguments</li> <li>Grounds are minimal, and little support for claims, counterarguments and responses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claims are missing, incoherent or purely factual</li> <li>Counterarguments are absent, or irrelevant to the claims</li> <li>Responses are absent, or irrelevant to the counterarguments</li> <li>Grounds are absent, or misaligned with claims, counterarguments and responses</li> </ul>
Criteria	A / A- (24 or above)	B+ / B / B- (20-23)	C+ / C / C- (15-19)	D (14)	F (13 or below)
<b>Argument Structure (30%)</b>  <i>Argumentation Model Adherence &amp; Logical Interconnectedness of Components</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All model components are fully and appropriately applied</li> <li>All model components are logically connected (e.g., warrants clearly bridge grounds and claims)</li> <li>Claims and rebuttals are integrated seamlessly, strengthening the argument</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1–2 components are incomplete or weakly applied</li> <li>1-2 components lack logical connection (e.g., grounds do not fully support claims)</li> <li>Claims and rebuttals are present but may be underdeveloped</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 or more components are missing or inappropriately applied</li> <li>2-3 or more components are not logically connected (e.g., grounds and claims are unrelated)</li> <li>Claims and rebuttals are minimal or fail to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Missing multiple components</li> <li>Components are poorly connected</li> <li>Claims and rebuttals may be off-topic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Missing most or all components</li> <li>Components presented, if any, are not logically connected</li> <li>Claims and rebuttals are incoherent or absent</li> </ul>

			address key counterarguments		
Criteria	A / A- (16 or above)	B+ / B / B- (13-15)	C+ / C / C- (10-12)	D (9)	F (8 or below)
<b>Organisation &amp; Clarity (20%)</b>  <i>Flow of Ideas and Cohesion, Tone, Paraphrasing</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a well-structured paper with a clear thesis statement in the introduction, an effective topic sentence for each body paragraph, and a relevant conclusion</li> <li>Formal tone with no informal language (e.g., contractions, colloquialisms, or conversational phrasing)</li> <li>No instances of direct copying from sources</li> <li>Highly effective use of cohesive devices</li> <li>Effective paraphrasing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis statement is present but may be imprecise</li> <li>Topic sentences are clear but may not fully align with the thesis or lack development</li> <li>Conclusion summarises a few points only</li> <li>Predominantly formal but may include some lapses (e.g., a contraction, slightly informal word choice)</li> <li>Few instances of direct copying from sources</li> <li>Effective use of cohesive devices</li> <li>Adequate paraphrasing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis statement is vague or off-topic</li> <li>Topic sentences are weak or disconnected from the thesis</li> <li>Conclusion is repetitive or does not summarise key points</li> <li>Frequent use of informal phrasing (e.g. conversational language, slang)</li> <li>Some instances of direct copying from sources</li> <li>Somewhat effective use of cohesive devices</li> <li>Some paraphrasing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis statement is missing or incoherent</li> <li>Topic sentences are absent or unrelated to the thesis</li> <li>Conclusion is missing or does not address the topic</li> <li>Overly casual (e.g. text-message style, excessive first-person pronouns)</li> <li>Many instances of direct copying from sources</li> <li>Ineffective use of cohesive devices</li> <li>Little paraphrasing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highly inappropriate for academic writing (e.g., excessive slang, informal tone throughout)</li> <li>Unintelligible or incoherent sentences</li> <li>No use of cohesive devices</li> <li>Plagiarised content</li> <li>No logical structure</li> <li>Missing thesis or topic sentences</li> <li>No paraphrasing</li> </ul>
Criteria	A / A- (8 or above)	B+ / B / B- (6.5-7.5)	C+ / C / C- (5.0-6.0)	D (4.5)	F (4 or below)
<b>Citations &amp; References (10%)</b>  <i>APA Referencing Style</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correct use of signal phrases and quotations</li> <li>No missing or misplaced citations</li> <li>All secondary citations, if any, are correctly cited</li> <li>Fully follows the APA referencing style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May occasionally forget page numbers, or quotation marks for direct quotes</li> <li>Most sources are correctly cited</li> <li>Some secondary citations, if any, are correctly cited</li> <li>Minor errors in APA referencing style (e.g.,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No citations for direct quotations</li> <li>Citations are missing in most cited sources</li> <li>Secondary citations, if any, are missing or incorrectly cited</li> <li>Frequent errors in APA referencing style (e.g., missing years,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No citations for direct quotations</li> <li>Citations are rarely seen</li> <li>Citations, if any, do not follow the APA referencing style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No citations for direct quotations or paraphrased content</li> <li>Citations, if any, may be fabricated</li> <li>Potential plagiarism</li> </ul>

Draft as of 16 Dec 2025

		missing parentheses, incorrect punctuation)	incorrect author order)		
--	--	--	----------------------------	--	--



## Reflection on AI Use in Argument Construction and Evaluation (Final) - 5%

Total: \_\_\_\_ / 5%

Criteria	A / A- (4 or above)			B+ / B / B- (3.3-3.7)	C+ / C / C- (2.5-3.0)		D or below (2.3 or below)			
<b>Depth of Reflection</b> <i>(Critical Analysis)</i>	5	4.5	4	3.5	3.0	2.5	2	1.5	1.0	
	• Insightful critique of AI's role in learning by comparing specific examples of pre-/post-AI work			• Some critical observations about AI's contribution within the learning process with some comparison between versions	• Some attempt to reflect on AI's contribution within the learning process, but with little comparison between versions		• Little to no reflection or only describes AI use			
	• Detailed justifications for edits (e.g., "Rejected AI's suggestion due to oversimplification; added a scholarly source instead")			• Some explanations for edits (e.g., "AI's version better aligns with the context")	• Vague reasoning (e.g., "AI's version is better than my draft")		• Little to no justification			
<b>Rationale for AI Adoption/Rejection</b> <i>(Justification)</i>										
<b>Evidence of Iteration</b> <i>(Process Documentation)</i>	• Full record of interactions (prompts, outputs, edits) showing a clear evolution from draft to final version			• Partial documentation (e.g., missing prompts) showing some revisions but not tracked	• Minimal evidence		• Little to no documentation provided			

## Critical Response to Academic Arguments - 20%

Total: \_\_\_\_ / 100% x 0.2 = \_\_\_\_ / 20%

Criteria	A / A- (32 or above)					B+ / B / B- (26-31)						C+ / C / C- (20-25)						D or below (19 or below)				
<b>Summary Accuracy (40%)</b>  <i>Coverage of Main Ideas, Precision and Avoidance of Misinterpretation</i>	35	34	33	32		31	30	29	28	27	26	25	24	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	16	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Includes all the main ideas from the argument in the recording</li><li>Free from personal bias or unsupported claims</li><li>No distortion, exaggeration, or oversimplification of the original meaning of main ideas</li></ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Captures most of the main ideas</li><li>No personal views are included</li><li>May include some unnecessary details</li><li>May contain minor inaccuracies only in wording or emphasis but no major misinterpretation of main ideas</li></ul>						<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Omits <b>multiple</b> main ideas</li><li>May occasionally include personal views</li><li>Includes some unnecessary details</li><li>Includes irrelevant details or unsupported claims</li><li>Contains some inaccuracies resulting in misinterpretation or distortion of the original meaning of main ideas</li></ul>						<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Makes significant omissions or misinterprets main ideas</li><li>Includes irrelevant details</li><li>May fabricate claims not present in the source</li></ul>				
Criteria	A / A- (24 or above)					B+ / B / B- (20-23)				C+ / C / C- (15-19)					D or below (14 or below)							
<b>Counterargument Quality (30%)</b>  <i>Logic, Evidence, Persuasiveness</i>  Bonus point for correct use of hedging and boosting	28	27	26	25	24	23	22	21	20		19	18	17	16	15		14	13	12			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Counterargument successfully addresses the argument</li><li>Grounds are highly effective in supporting the claim</li></ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Counterargument addresses the argument</li><li>Grounds are generally effective in supporting the claim</li></ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Counterargument attempts to address the argument</li><li>Grounds are sometimes effective in supporting the claim</li></ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Counterargument does not address the argument or is not attempted</li><li>Minimal grounds used</li></ul>							
<b>Verbal Delivery (30%)</b>  <i>Clarity, Pronunciation, Fluency</i>	28	27	26	25	24	23	22	21	20		19	18	17	16	15		14	13	12			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Very clear and accurate pronunciation</li><li>Highly effective use of pauses, stress and intonation</li><li>High degree of preciseness of word choice and grammatical accuracy</li></ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Clear and accurate pronunciation</li><li>Effective use of pauses, stress and intonation</li><li>Preciseness of word choice and grammatical accuracy</li></ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Somewhat clear and accurate pronunciation</li><li>Somewhat effective use of pauses, stress and intonation</li><li>Somewhat precise in terms of word choice and grammatical accuracy</li></ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Often unclear and inaccurate pronunciation</li><li>Often ineffective use of pauses, stress and intonation</li><li>Often lacking precision in terms of word choice and grammatical accuracy</li></ul>							

## Reflective Learning Portfolio - 10%

Total: \_\_\_\_ / 10%

Criteria	A / A- (8 or above)					B+ / B / B- (6.5-7.5)			C+ / C / C- (5.0-6.0)			D or below (4.5 or below)			
	10	9.5	9	8.5	8	7.5	7	6.5	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4	3.5	
<b>Depth of Reflection</b> ( <i>Critical Analysis</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insightful critique of AI's role in learning by comparing specific examples of pre-/post-AI work</li> </ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some critical observations about AI's contribution within the learning process with some comparison between versions</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some attempt to reflect on AI's contribution within the learning process, but with little comparison between versions</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little to no reflection or only describes AI use</li> </ul>			
<b>Rationale for AI Adoption/Rejection</b> ( <i>Justification</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed justifications for edits (e.g., "Rejected AI's suggestion due to oversimplification; added a scholarly source instead")</li> </ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some explanations for edits (e.g., "AI's version better aligns with the context")</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vague reasoning (e.g., "AI's version is better than my draft")</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little to no justification</li> </ul>			
<b>Evidence of Iteration</b> ( <i>Process Documentation</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full record of interactions (prompts, outputs, edits) showing a clear evolution from draft to final version</li> </ul>					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partial documentation (e.g., missing prompts) showing some revisions but not tracked</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal evidence</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little to no documentation provided</li> </ul>			

## Class Participation - 5%

Total: \_\_\_\_ / 5%

Criteria	A / A- (4 or above)			B+ / B / B- (3.3-3.7)	C+ / C / C- (2.5-3.0)		D or below (2.3 or below)			
	5	4.5	4	3.5	3.0	2.5	2	1.5	1.0	
<b>Participation in learning tasks and activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Always responsive in class</li> <li>Always engages with other students</li> <li>Always contributes ideas</li> <li>Always prepared before class</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Frequently responsive in class</li> <li>Often engages with other students</li> <li>Often contributes ideas</li> <li>Often prepared before class</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sometimes responsive in class</li> <li>Sometimes engages with other students</li> <li>Sometimes contributes ideas</li> <li>Sometimes prepared before class</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rarely or never responsive in class</li> <li>Rarely or never engages with other students</li> <li>Rarely or never contributes ideas</li> <li>Rarely or never prepared before class</li> </ul>			
<b>Attendance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attended 90-100% of classes</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attended 70-80% of classes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attended 60-70% of classes</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attended 50% or less of classes</li> </ul>			
<b>Punctuality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Always punctual</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Often punctual</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sometimes punctual</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rarely or never punctual</li> </ul>			
<b>Out-of-class Learning</b> (e.g., homework, seeking teacher's assistance when needed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Always engages in out-of-class learning</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Often engages in out-of-class learning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sometimes engages in out-of-class learning</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rarely or never engages in out-of-class learning</li> </ul>			