

LING/ANTH 520 | Grading criteria: Article proposal

	Excellent (A)	Competent (B-C)	Needs work (D-F)
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 graded as a **lab assignment** worth **10 points**.

LING/ANTH 520 | Grading criteria: Article report

	Excellent (A)	Competent (B-C)	Needs work (D-F)
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 graded as a **component of the final project** worth **15%**.