

## Scoring rubric for letter addressed to a policy maker

*Adapted from Brewer, C.A., and D. Ebert-May. 1998. Hearing the case for genetic engineering: breaking down the barriers of anonymity through student hearings in the large lecture hall. Journal of College Science Teaching 28 (2): 97-101.*

Level of Achievement	General Presentation	Conceptual Understanding	Critical Thinking Ability to Support Ideas
<b>Excellent 50 points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addresses a specific policy maker</li> <li>Makes clear the position of the policy maker</li> <li>Presents a specific call to action</li> <li>States the student's position clearly</li> <li>Presents argument in logical fashion</li> <li>Excellent, respectful, and engaging writing style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates advanced understanding of the science</li> <li>Broad information to support argument both scientifically and socially</li> <li>Understands implications of policy for science and society</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draws on 4-5 specific references beyond assigned readings</li> <li>Makes 3-4 strong concise points, each with two pieces of supporting evidence using data</li> <li>Draws on arguments of allies</li> <li>Addresses opposition with strong counterarguments</li> <li>Interprets data appropriately</li> <li>Provides specific examples to support view</li> <li>Draws logical conclusions</li> </ul>
<b>Good 46-40 points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addresses a specific policy maker</li> <li>Presents a specific call to action</li> <li>States the student's position clearly, but may throw in information with little relevance</li> <li>Organizes information clearly most of the time</li> <li>Good writing style and appropriate and respectful use of vocabulary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates basic understanding of the science</li> <li>Broad information to support argument but sometimes jumbled</li> <li>Understands most implications of the policy for science and society</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draws on 3-4 specific references beyond the assigned readings</li> <li>Makes 1-2 points with each with one piece of supporting evidence and data</li> <li>Draws on allies but does not incorporate their arguments</li> <li>Refers to opposition but does not adequately present a counterargument</li> <li>Interprets data appropriately</li> <li>Draws logical conclusions</li> </ul>
<b>Adequate 39-35 points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not address a controversial issue explicitly, but tangentially</li> <li>Does not state a specific call to action</li> <li>Does not state a position explicitly and will throw in extraneous information</li> <li>Shows some effort to express logical argument</li> <li>Occasionally disorganized and hard to follow</li> <li>Moderately engaging, bordering on disrespectful</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates minimal understanding of the science</li> <li>Limited information to support argument</li> <li>Adequate understanding of data but little presented</li> <li>Refers to the social and scientific implications of the policy but in a limited scope</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draws on few (1-2) additional references and provides little supporting evidence</li> <li>Makes few connections between data, argument and conclusions</li> <li>Does not adequately recognize the opposition's stance</li> <li>Makes some errors in interpretation and application of data and evidence</li> </ul>

<b>Inadequate 34-20 points</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presents an unfocused overview</li> <li>• Does not address a specific policy maker or group</li> <li>• Does not state position nor call to action</li> <li>• Does not present clear arguments about the issue</li> <li>• Does not use logic</li> <li>• Un-engaging, disrespectful, and rambling writing style</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates little to no understanding of the science</li> <li>• Does not identify any factors that influence issue and will draw on irrelevant information</li> <li>• Does not understand implications of policy for science and society</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not use any additional references other than those assigned in class</li> <li>• Provides no data or evidence to support arguments</li> <li>• Misreads/misinterprets information</li> <li>• Makes no connections between data, argument and conclusions</li> <li>• Lacks logic</li> <li>• Does not address opposition in any way</li> </ul>
<b>No effort 0 points</b>			