

| Article | Score | Skilful 2 | Developing 1 | Beginning 0 |
|--|-------|--|--|--|
| 1 news_article | | Selected a news article that is long enough, in the appropriate style, published in a recognizable (to us) news source, contains content relevant to their topic. An editorial or opinion piece can still be scored 2/skilful. | Selected item similar to a news article, that is either too short or a different genre of writing. Including relevant publications that are from a blog or other source that seems more dubious. Ex. A blog, a trade publication or scholarly article. If they meet all the criteria for skilful except there is no author, score as a 1. If it's hard to tell that it is a news article, score as a 1. | Something that does not resemble a news article, or they didn't select anything. If you are unable to locate the student's article, score this as a zero and continue scoring the rest of the response as normal. |
| 2 news_job_edu | | Found information on both job experience and education for their author OR showed evidence of trying to find the information for both areas and shared their process for doing that. Still rate as 2 even if student found only the university or institution that gave the degree, but did not list the field or area of the degree. | Found information on only one area. (If you see a major reason to think they may have looked up information for someone who did not write the article, look it up to verify. If they found information, but about the wrong author, then score as a 1. Score the rest of the response as normal) | Did not find any information on the author's job experience or education. |
| 3 news_community <i>weighted *2 when scoring student work to 100%</i> | | Identified communities or identities AND EXPLAINED how it was OR was not relevant to the topic of the article—even if the topic is not explicitly articulated so much as referenced. | Identified communities or identities—whether or not it appears relevant to us—but did NOT explain how it was OR was not relevant to the topic of the article. If the student identified specific professional communities that include a specific element—like a discipline or field—it can be scored as a 1. Examples of a 1 response: "is a student at this university," "is involved with political parties," or "part of the international community." Communities or identities should be something that could possibly impact who the author is and how they see the world. | Did not share any information about communities or identities. Job title OR name of employer WITHOUT analysis can be scored as a 0. If they explain the relevance of something but it's not actually a community, still score as 0. |
| 4 news_authority | | Discussion of student's thought process at a minimum. Includes both specific information about sources and analysis that connects the sources to the topic and/or author's credibility. If they point out a specific relevant database, or a specific author (including a co-author), they EXPLAIN HOW the outside authority supports the author's idea or ties to the specific research topic. In general, the topic should be specifically referenced for a 2 score, BUT if the student did not name it and it is abundantly obvious how what they wrote connects to the topic, you can still score 2. | References one of the types of information specified in the question (interviews, quotes, citations, research, data or statistics) OR gives some analysis of how the author supports their ideas. If there is analysis, but it is limited or vague, like "there are a lot of references" or "they cited other research" or "they included statistics" you can still score as 1. Also still score as 1 if the analysis explaining how the sources support the author's ideas is vague, like "They cited other research that supports the main idea/topic" | Did not provide any information on how the author supported their claims or gave yes/no answer. If they chose an article that didn't include any sources, then score 0. |
| 5 news_overall <i>weighted *2 when scoring student work to 100%</i> | | Lists specific relevant aspects of authority AND has analysis (evidence or examples) that explicitly connects the author's information to their credibility on the topic. Even if the student's discussion of the elements of authority is vague, like "education and work" without specifying what kind of education and work, it's ok to still score as a 2. In general, the topic should be specifically referenced for a 2 score, BUT if the student did not name it and it is abundantly obvious how what they wrote connects to the topic, you can still score 2. | Includes at least one specific aspect of authority that is mentioned previously in this assignment (like outside sources, education, work experience, community) or we think is legit (life experience, publication or source credibility) OR they provide analysis connecting the author's information to their credibility on the topic, but their analysis doesn't reference a specific aspect of authority. You can still score as 1 if the topic is referenced but not named, like "the topic." | No relevant aspects or criteria were listed. |
| 1 scholarly_article | | Selected a scholarly article that is long enough and in the appropriate style. If it appears generally to be scholarly, like a trade publication with citations, we'll score it as a 2. | Selected item from a scholarly journal, but is not peer-reviewed . Ex. book or website review, letter to the editor, poster session, conference proceedings, just an abstract | Something that does not resemble a scholarly article, or they didn't select anything. If you are unable to locate the student's article, score this as a zero and continue scoring the rest of the response as normal. |
| 2 scholarly_job_edu | | Found information on both job experience and education for their author. Still rate as 2 even if student found only the university or institution that gave the degree, but did not list the field or area of the degree. | Found information on only one area or showed evidence of trying to find the information. (If you see a major reason to think they may have looked up information for someone who did not write the article, look it up to verify. If they found information, but about the wrong author, then score as a 1. Score the rest of the response as normal) | Did not find any information on the author's job experience or education. |
| 3 scholarly_community <i>weighted *2 when scoring student work to 100%</i> | | Identified communities or identities AND EXPLAINED how it was OR was not relevant to the topic of the article—even if the topic is not explicitly articulated so much as referenced. | Identified communities or identities—whether or not it appears relevant to us—but did NOT explain how it was OR was not relevant to the topic of the article. If the student identified specific professional communities that include a specific element—like a discipline or field—it can be scored as a 1. Examples of a 1 response: "is a student at this university," "is involved with political parties," or "part of the international community." Communities or identities should be something that could possibly impact who the author is and how they see the world. | Did not share any information about communities or identities. Job title OR name of employer WITHOUT analysis can be scored as a 0. If they explain the relevance of something but it's not actually a community, still score as 0. |
| 4 scholarly_authority | | Discussion of student's thought process at a minimum. Includes both specific information about sources and analysis that connects the sources to the topic and/or author's credibility. If they point out a specific relevant database, or a specific author (including a co-author), they EXPLAIN HOW the outside authority supports the author's idea or ties to the specific research topic. In general, the topic should be specifically referenced for a 2 score, BUT if the student did not name it and it is abundantly obvious how what they wrote connects to the topic, you can still score 2. | References one of the types of information specified in the question (interviews, quotes, citations, research, data or statistics) OR gives some analysis of how the author supports their ideas. If there is analysis, but it is limited or vague, like "there are a lot of references" or "they cited other research" or "they included statistics" you can still score as 1. Also still score as 1 if the analysis explaining how the sources support the author's ideas is vague, like "They cited other research that supports the main idea/topic" | Did not provide any information on how the author supported their claims or gave yes/no answer. If they chose an article that didn't include any sources, then score 0. |
| 5 scholarly_overall <i>weighted *2 when scoring student work to 100%</i> | | Lists specific relevant aspects of authority AND has analysis (evidence or examples) that explicitly connects the author's information to their credibility on the topic. Even if the student's discussion of the elements of authority is vague, like "education and work" without specifying what kind of education and work, it's ok to still score as a 2. In general, the topic should be specifically referenced for a 2 score, BUT if the student did not name it and it is abundantly obvious how what they wrote connects to the topic, you can still score 2. | Includes at least one specific aspect of authority that is mentioned previously in this assignment (like outside sources, education, work experience, community) or we think is legit (life experience, publication or source credibility) OR they provide analysis (evidence or examples) about the author's credibility on the topic, but their analysis doesn't reference a specific aspect of authority. You can still score as 1 if the topic is referenced but not named, like "the topic." | No relevant aspects or criteria were listed. |
| Comparison <i>weighted *2 when scoring student work to 100%</i> | | The student mentions both articles AND addresses at least one element of authority for both articles or authors (whether the student says that the element is present or absent) AND ties that information back to the topic of the articles in some way. Tying back to the topic doesn't need to be explicit as long as it is abundantly obvious to the coder that there is a connection. Even if the student's discussion of the elements of authority is vague, like "education and work" without specifying what kind of education and work, it's ok to still score as a 2. | Only mentions a specific element of authority for one article. OR mentions elements of authority for both articles, but does not tie them back to the topic of the article OR If the student compares one article to the other without explicitly addressing the authority of the second article then score as a 1. | Doesn't list any relevant elements of authority. OR says that one article is more authoritative than the other just because it is a scholarly or news article. |

| Scoring | |
|----------------------|----|
| Total possible score | 32 |
| Score | 0 |
| Percentage | 0% |