

DRAFT grading criteria — final version to be implemented in Canvas

LING/ANTH 520 | Grading criteria: Article proposal

	Excellent	Getting there	Needs work
Article proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has full citation; follows format Has article link Article meets all criteria Insightful description of expt Connection to project made clear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial, or wrong format Link is missing Art. meets some criteria Some description of expt Some connection to proj 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not turned in on time Citation is missing Art. bad fit for criteria No description of expt No connection to proj

→ The article proposal is worth **5/100 points** toward the final project.

LING/ANTH 520 | Grading criteria: Article report

	Excellent	Getting there	Needs work
Discussion of structure of experiment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified, explained RQs / hypotheses Insightfully explained relevance of stimuli and design Identified, explained measurement criteria Factually correct 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RQs identified but not clearly explained Relevance of stimuli/design only {some little} explained Meas criteria IDed; only {some little} explained Minor factual errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion of RQs very unclear Relevance of stimuli and design not discussed Meas criteria not discussed Major factual errors
Insight and thought	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion is insightful; shows thought in understanding and explaining experiment, results Class knowledge applied appropriately 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion shows insight on some points, but others more superficially presented Minor problems in applying class knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little evidence of thought or insight in discussion Major problems in applying class knowledge
Mechanics and presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes full citation info Report is well organized; paragraphs focused, coherent; logic of discussion is clear Technical terminology used correctly Consistent with academic prose style; very few typos 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial, or wrong format Report a little short A few too many quotations Report shows some organization, but logic of discussion hard to follow Minor errors in technical terminology Minor deviations from academic prose style, or some typos 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No citation info Report very short Heavy use of quotations Order of ideas is haphazard or illogical Major errors in technical terminology Largely inconsistent with academic prose style, or many typos

→ The article report is worth **15/100 points** toward the final project.