

**GLA Academic Rubric**

<b>A+ Outstanding performance (Over 90%)</b>			
Input/Knowledge Comprehension	Thinking/Knowledge Evaluation	Judging/Ability to incorporate various viewpoints as well as ethical implication	Expression/Communication and articulation in oral or written forms
In addition to the quality of an A performance, student explores material beyond the course requirement. Data and knowledge collected are uniformly of superb quality.	In addition to the quality of an A performance, student can identify both the import and potential limit of deploying specific evaluation measures and offer ways of remedying such limits.	In addition to the quality of an A performance, student provides creative and innovative direction to research and learning.	In addition to the quality of an A performance, student can identify future direction the communicated knowledge can aspire towards, demonstrates reflective accounting of how the audience/reader responded to his/her expression. Citation practices are impeccable.
<b>A Excellent performance in most areas. The goals of the course are achieved with few problems (80-89%)</b>			
Input/Knowledge Comprehension	Thinking/Knowledge Evaluation	Judging/Ability to incorporate various viewpoints as well as ethical implication	Expression/Communication and articulation in oral or written forms
Student exercises appropriate and relevant academic skills (close reading; quantitative literacy; information literacy) and demonstrates a thorough and systematic comprehension of knowledge that pertains to the course. The scope of learning and research is appropriately defined and identified, and the student understands how to access and	Student evaluates information (as gained through research and lecture) and data gathered critically; can apply multiple criteria for using or rejecting certain sources and convey the reason why and how knowledge was evaluated.	Student effectively situates the finding in broader historical and geographical context; takes into consideration multiple perspectives as well as the ethical implication of endorsing specific perspective, is able to arrive at reasoned conclusion.	Student effectively articulates his/her findings to audiences both immediate (peers) and afar (broader public) in medium appropriate to the class requirement (oral, written, artwork, podcast, etc). Summary and context demonstrates clarity of understanding and willingness to communicate effectively with others; content's depth and scope are appropriately defined and decided; the main message and point is crystal clear and original and expressed in a manner which only he/she can

<p>collect relevant sources and data.</p>			<p>express; the student also demonstrates receptivity to feedbacks and responses. Mechanics (if in written form) and structures (in both written and oral forms) are impeccably applied, with little to no error. Citation practices are comprehensive and thorough.</p>
<p><b>B Good performance. The goals of the course are reached, but errors and insufficient areas remain (70-79%)</b></p>			
<p>Input/Knowledge Comprehension</p>	<p>Thinking/Knowledge Evaluation</p>	<p>Judging/Ability to incorporate various viewpoints as well as ethical implication</p>	<p>Expression/Communication and articulation in oral or written forms</p>
<p>Student exercises most of the appropriate and relevant academic skills (close reading; quantitative literacy; information literacy) and demonstrates a sufficient comprehension of knowledge that pertains to the course. There are some errors and misinterpretation of the material. The scope of learning and research is mostly narrowed down and explored sufficiently, although some element could use more depth. The student is able to mostly identify how and where to access and collect data appropriate to the course.</p>	<p>Student evaluates information and data gathered with several, but not all evaluation standards that could have been deployed. In most cases the students can explain why such evaluation is relevant, but these are often implied rather than explicit.</p>	<p>Student identifies the broader historical and geographical context, yet how the part relates to the whole can be better connected. Most alternative explanations and perspectives are taken into account, and the judging conveys an awareness of why the accounting of multiple perspectives is crucial. How the conclusion is arrived at can be inferred to, but can be more explicitly connected.</p>	<p>Student articulates his/her findings to audiences both immediate (peers) and afar (broader public) in medium appropriate to the class requirement (oral, written, artwork, podcast, etc). Summary and context demonstrates sufficient understanding and willingness to communicate with others; content's depth and scope are sufficiently defined and decided although there may be one or two items that may be obviously missing; the main message and point is stated although may be wanting in originality; the student also demonstrates receptivity to feedbacks and responses. Mechanics (if in written form) and structures (in both written and oral forms) are mostly applied, with a few errors, but not to an extent where it detracts attention from the materials expressed (in written or oral</p>

			form). Citation practices are properly implemented and consistent.
<b>C Performance that minimally meets the course criteria (60-69%)</b>			
<b>Input/Knowledge Comprehension</b>	<b>Thinking/Knowledge Evaluation</b>	<b>Judging/Ability to incorporate various viewpoints as well as ethical implication</b>	<b>Expression/Communication and articulation in oral or written forms</b>
Student applies one or few of appropriate academic skills (close reading; quantitative literacy; information literacy), yet the process of knowledge comprehension mostly remains passive. Some of the knowledge are misinterpreted or erroneously treated. For research why one source is explored as opposed to other is unclear, and more direction in knowledge acquisition can be useful. The student relies on conventional sources and shows little decision-making in terms of asking why this, as opposed to other, data.	Student evaluates information and attempts to apply one or more of critical thinking skills to assess the relevance of knowledge; the application of certain evaluation measures are unsystematic and the reasoning behind the selection is not immediately obvious.	Student alludes to the broader historical and geographical context, yet how the part relates to the whole is unclear. Some alternative explanations and perspectives are taken into account, yet the judging does not convey an awareness of why the accounting of multiple perspectives is crucial. How the conclusion is arrived at remains difficult to understand although there is a thesis.	Student articulates his/her findings to audiences both immediate (peers) and afar (broader public) in medium appropriate to the class requirement (oral, written, artwork, podcast, etc). Summary and context may be mentioned yet vague; content's depth and scope are either too lengthy or too short; the main message and point is not immediately comprehensible although efforts are made to place together and share the findings; mechanics (if in written form) and structures (in both written and oral forms) are inconsistently applied with significant amount of errors and mistakes that detracts from the audience/readers' attempt to follow the students' writing or oral presentation. Citation practices are inconsistent and incomplete.
<b>F Performance that does not meet the minimum course criteria (below 59%)</b>			
<b>Input/Knowledge Comprehension</b>	<b>Thinking/Knowledge Evaluation</b>	<b>Judging/Ability to incorporate various viewpoints as well as ethical implication</b>	<b>Expression/Communication and articulation in oral or written forms</b>

<p>Student committed plagiarism; inconsistent and unethical use of sources and data; knowledge gathered are gathered without coherence or direction.</p>	<p>Student shows little active engagement with the knowledge received; data and information gathered are taken as facts which are in no need of assessment without any reason.</p>	<p>There is no thesis or viewpoint expressed; several approaches may be listed, yet remain a collection of others' perspectives rather than an effective articulation of one's reasoned judgment.</p>	<p>The audience/reader are left with little clue as to what the topic was about, what the stake is, how/why the matter is relevant; organization of means of communication is wanting and unilateral. Standard efforts to communicate clearly (mechanics, citations, appropriate use of references) are mostly missing. Little to no citation offered.</p>
--	--	---	--