**Rubric for Lab E-portfolio Entries Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
Physics XXX: Course Title** Date Assessed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*This rubric is used to evaluate e-portfolio entries connected to lab sections of Physics XXX, taught by Dr. Thomas Kling. Students write entries before and after lab based on specified topics.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gross Mistakes****(binary)** | The reader did not find gross mistakes that would immediately cast suspicion on the effort / expertise of the e-portfolio’s creator (taking into account the student’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** |
| **Scientific accuracy** | This reader thinks the science is accurately described.  | This reader thinks the science is mostly correct. | The writer makes mistakes in the science that an average student should not make. | The writer makes serious errors in describing the science accurately. |
| **Detail and Audience** | The portfolio uses an appropriate number of technical terms, explaining new concepts that would not be familiar to a new science or math college freshman. | The portfolio uses some technical terms, but occasion-ally shies away from places where they would be ap-propriate. Or, new concepts are occasionally not explained. | The portfolio 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 portfolio does not include technical language or does not attempt to explain unfamiliar concepts.  |
| **Evidence** | The portfolio links to evidence in the evidence folder or includes pictures, data, or graphs. These are well explained. | The portfolio occasionally links to evidence or includes data, pictures, or graphs, but misses some opportunities to do so. | The portfolio rarely links to evidence and misses several opportunities to do so.  | The portfolio 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 portfolio made it enjoyable to read. The writer uses a lot of sentence variety and strong word choices. | The reader thinks the writing in this port-folio 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 port-folio is awkward, repetitive, and/or wordy. The writing was not engaging. |
| **Correctness: Grammar and writing mechanics** | This reader noticed few errors, if any. The portfolio 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. | This reader noticed numerous grammatical / mechanical errors, and those errors interfered at times with the reader’s understanding 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 portfolio difficult to understand, and the reader questioned the writer’s professionalism because of these recurrent mistakes. |