Enclosure 1.

Category	Basic-F (Points)	Novice-C (Points)	Ingenious-B (Points)	Mastery-A (Points)
1. Problem Framing & Scope Weight ___%	1.1 Project purpose/thesis is not present or extremely unclear to the point where the audience does not understand the problem.	1.1 Project has a purpose/thesis that is missing information or contains too much information. The audience has a general understanding of the issue at hand but does not clearly understand.	1.1 Project has a well-stated purpose/thesis which enables audience to have a good understanding of issue at hand but is missing minor essential elements or contains extraneous information.	1.1 Project has a clearly stated purpose or thesis which enables the audience to clearly understand the issue at hand.
	1.2 Disciplines used do not apply directly to issue at hand.	1.2 Discipline use is faulty and contains 3+ extraneous subject use.	1.2 Appropriate disciplines/subjects used. 1-2 extraneous topics that do not tie into presentation well.	1.2 Appropriate disciplines/subjects used; no extraneous topics used.
	1.3 Ideas and issues very unclear.	1.3 ideas and issues unclear.	1.3 Ideas and issues delineated well.	1.3 Ideas and issues clearly delineated
2. Discipline Knowledge Weight ___%	2.1 Faulty base knowledge. Basic understanding in chosen topics is not present.	2.1 Baseline subject knowledge and understanding in chosen topics.	2.1 Good base subject knowledge and demonstrated basic understanding in chosen topics.	2.1 Strong base subject knowledge. Demonstrated depth of understanding in chosen topics.
	2.2 Inappropriate use of knowledge. Severe errors in application of discipline knowledge.	2.2 Appropriate use of knowledge. Severe errors in application of discipline knowledge to issue at hand.	2.2 Appropriate use of knowledge. Slight errors in discipline application to issue at hand.	2.2 Appropriate use of knowledge. Correctly utilizes discipline knowledge in application to issue at hand.
3. Integration of Ideas Weight ___%	3.1 Provides multi-dimensional solutions that are not feasible and/or practical due to little understanding of the issue at land. Connection of ideas is faulty.	3.1 Provides multi-dimensional, practical conclusions. Ideas may not be completely feasible because of errors or misunderstanding of the issue at hand. Ideas are connected, but not seamlessly.	3.1 Provides multi-dimensional, feasible, practical conclusions. Ideas are connected, but not seamlessly.	3.1 Provides multi-dimensional, feasible, practical conclusions with multi-faceted and seamlessly connected ideas.
	3.2 Integration not present or is irrational and/or ineffective. Imbalance of discipline detracts from intention of project.	3.2 Integration is present but is irrational or ineffectiveness. Disciplines are integrated but very unbalanced.	3.2 Integration is rationale and for the most part effective. Disciplines are integrated but are imbalanced.	3.2 Integration is rationale and effective. Disciplines are both integrated and balanced.
	3.3 Unclear or non-present findings, conclusions, recommendations, and/or examples. Or said topics not grounded in discipline(s') knowledge.	3.3 Decent findings, conclusions, recommendations, and/or examples with connections to discipline knowledge.	3.3 Sound findings, conclusions, recommendations, and/or examples grounded in discipline knowledge.	3.3 Quality findings, conclusions, recommendations, and examples from grounded discipline knowledge.
	3.4 Ideas are laundry-listed and are not well explained and/or integrated.	3.4 Basic range of subject integration present. Ideas somewhat laundry-listed and do not contain explanations or integration.	3.4 Good range of subject integration opportunities are exploited.	3.4 Full range of subject integration opportunities have been sought out and exploited.
4. Clarity of Purpose Weight ___%	4.1 Does not grasp the breadth and depth of the issue in question to an acceptable level.	4.1 Understands the scale of the issue in question but does not effectively communicate it.	4.1 Demonstrates a general understanding of the issue in question's breadth or depth.	4.1 Demonstrates clear understanding of the issue in question's breadth and depth.
	4.2 A general purpose of investigation is present but not to a satisfactory level or is not present.	4.2 Defines the purpose of investigation to a satisfactory level, but contains extraneous matter or loose ends.	4.2 Defined purpose of investigation is present.	4.2 Clearly defines the purpose of investigation.
5. Reflection Weight ___%	5.1 Ideas in project are connected and demonstrate minimal reflection on the importance of the issue at large.	5.1 Connections of ideas demonstrates some reflection on disciplinary interconnectivity and the importance of the issue at large.	5.1 Connection of ideas indicates student has reflected on the interconnectivity and importance of the issue at large.	5.1 Clear and delineated connection of ideas indicates student has reflected on the interconnectivity and importance of the issue at large.
	5.2 Course Specific Reflection (if desired)	5.2 Course Specific Reflection (if desired)	5.2 Course Specific Reflection (if desired)	5.2 Course Specific Reflection (if desired)
6. Appropriate Presentation Weight ___%	6.1 Information is conveyed in such a way that detracts from the understanding of the problem at hand.	6.1 Information is conveyed in such a way that the audience has a general understanding of the problem at hand. Instances of laundry-listing are present and slightly detract from the coherence of the project.	6.1 Information is conveyed in such a way that the audience understands the scope of the problem and ideas are well-conveyed. Minor instances of laundry listing that do not detract from the coherency of the project.	6.1 Information conveyed in such a way that audience understands the scope of the problem coherently conveyed ideas (not laundry listed subjects).
	6.2 Presentation order is illogical and/or has discrepancies that detract from the logic, articulation, fluidity, or the presentation of ideas. Appropriate tone and/or dept not present.	6.2 Presentation order has discrepancies in logic or fluidity. Ideas are not well articulated. Appropriate tone and depth present, but is not overall effective.	6.2 Presentation order is logical and fluid with minor discrepancies. Ideas are articulated and conveyed well. Effective tone and depth present.	6.2 Presentation order is logical and fluid. Ideas are articulated and conveyed effectively. Appropriate and effective tone and depth present.
	6.3 Terms not defined appropriately or project presented with terminology in such a way that it detracts from the audience's understanding. And/or use of inappropriate terminology or language.	6.3 Appropriate terms used but not defined fully for audience/setting context.	6.3 Terms appropriately defined and used as needed for audience/setting; minor discrepancies in use or understanding of terminology or language.	6.3 Terms appropriately define and used as needed for audience/setting; appropriate use of terminology and language.
	6.4 Errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, and format distract from the project content. Project format is generally incorrect.	6.4 Grammar, punctuation, spelling, and format contain significant errors that detract from the project content slightly. Project format is still generally correct.	6.4 Proper grammar, punctuation, spelling, and format used throughout with minimal errors. Project format uses general correctness.	6.4 Proper grammar, punctuation, spelling, and format used throughout with no errors.