

Bioengineering References Rubric

Instructor: Z. Maria Oden

Team Name: _____

		Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3
1.	Format of references	/5		
2.	Quality of references	/15		
3.	Updating reference list as appropriate		/5	/2
4.	Response to comments/ previous grading		/5	/3
	TOTAL:	/20	/10	/5

Grading elements in References

	Excellent (max pts)	Average (mid pts)	Poor (lowest pts)
Format of references cited	Formatting is professional and consistent between different types of citations. Complete information is provided with each reference.	Formatting is somewhat, but not completely, consistent between different types of citations. Complete information is not provided with each reference.	Reference list does not have consistent formatting. References would be hard to find with the information provided.
Quality of references	References demonstrate extensive research in all aspects of team's project area. Sources are peer-reviewed and credible. Citations appear appropriately in text. Appropriate additions to reference list continue to be made as team progresses through project	References are incomplete. Team may have neglected some aspects of its project area or consulted inappropriate or "soft" sources. OR citation method may be inadequate, with sources not cited when needed.	Literature cited neglects key aspects of project OR comprises mainly "soft" sources OR citations are absent (no references cited in text).
Updating	References are updated appropriately as new information is needed, new directions are taken or new information becomes available.	Team finds some relevant additional resources to reference but some areas are not covered.	Team does not update references with any new ones despite taking a new direction with project or needing more complete information.
Response to comments and previous grading	Team has thoughtfully considered feedback and input from graders in prior cycles. Work in this cycle demonstrates team's effort actively improve the document, going above and beyond specific points called out by the grader.	Team has incorporated most of the specific changes made by graders, but revisions do not address deep or more substantive problems with the document.	Team has ignored grader feedback or taken only minimal steps to improve the document.