**Rubric for Research Blogs Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** Date Assessed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Physics 199: Scientists at Work STREAMS Summer Bridge**

*This rubric is used to evaluate research blogs connected to the First Year Seminar, Physics 199: Scientists at Work, taught by Dr. Thomas Kling in association with the STREAMS Summer Bridge for incoming science and math majors. Students write blog entries on most evenings based on writing prompts that encourage reflective thinking about their research experiences.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gross Mistakes****(binary)** | The reader did not find gross mistakes that would immediately cast suspicion on the effort / expertise of the blog’s creator (taking into account the blogger’s experience). | The reader found gross mistakes that would immediately make an average reader suspicious or feel negative about the blog. |
|  | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Poor** |
| **Purpose / Main Point** | This reader thinks the writer’s purpose is clear and that the topics addressed are appropriate.  | This reader thinks the writer’s purpose and topics are mostly appropriate. | The writer often loses focus on the main point of the blog or topic. | This reader has a difficult time determining why the writer has created this blog. |
| **Audience** | The blog uses an appropriate number of technical terms, explaining new concepts that would not be familiar to a new science or math college freshman. | The blog uses some technical terms, but occasionally shies away from places where they would be appropriate. Or, new concepts are occasionally not explained. | The blog avoids using appropriate technical language or fails to describe new ideas or concepts that would not be familiar to a math or science major college freshman. | The blog does not include technical language or does not attempt to explain unfamiliar concepts.  |
| **Evidence** | The blog links to evidence in the evidence folder or includes pictures, data, or graphs. These are well explained. | The blog occasionally links to evidence or includes data, pictures, or graphs, but it misses some key opportunities to do so. | The blog rarely links to evidence and misses several opportunities to do so.  | The blog does not include important, appropriate evidence that the writer had access to. |
| **Sentence style:** **Flow of writing** | The reader thinks the clear, concise writing in this blog made it enjoyable to read. The writer uses a lot of sentence variety and strong word choices. | The reader thinks the writing in this blog is good, but perhaps the writer could have introduced a little more variety and/or written in a more concise fashion. | The reader thinks some of the writing is awkward and/or the writer relies too heavily on the same kind of sentence structure. | This reader thinks much of the writing in this blog is awkward, repetitive, and/or wordy. The writing was not engaging. |
| **Correctness: Grammar and writing mechanics** | This reader noticed few errors, if any. The blog is clear, and the writer shows considerable mastery of the language. | This reader noticed some grammatical / mechanical errors, but these errors did not interfere with the reader’s understanding of the blog’s purpose. | This reader noticed numerous grammatical / mechanical errors, and those errors interfered at times with the reader’s understanding of the blog’s purpose and/or caused the reader to question the writer’s skill and expertise. | This reader noticed many grammatical / mechanical errors. The reader felt the number of errors made the blog difficult to understand, and the reader questioned the writer’s professionalism because of these recurrent mistakes. |