

SCOM 313 Bibliography Rubric

	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point
Citation	All of the new food communication related sources and the one annotation bibliography meets the Chicago Style citation requirements with no errors.	Most of the new food communication related sources and the one annotation bibliography meets the Chicago Style citation with few errors.	Some of the new food communication related sources and the one annotation bibliography meets the Chicago Style citation requirements with numerous errors.	None of the new food communication related sources and the one annotation bibliography meets the Chicago Style citation requirements. All of the citations have substantial errors.
Relevant Sources	All of the submitted bibliographic citations and one annotation have clear and direct relevance to the weekly readings.	Most of the submitted bibliographic citations and one annotation have some relevance to the weekly readings.	The submitted bibliographic citations and one annotation have no clear relevance to the weekly assigned readings but are connected to food communication.	The submitted bibliographic citations and one annotation have zero relevance to food communication.
On-time	All of the bibliographic entries and one annotation were turned in by the weekly deadline.	Most of the bibliographic entries and one annotation were turned in by the weekly deadline, maybe one was turned in slightly after the weekly deadline.	Some of the bibliographic entries and one annotation were turned in on time and some were turned in significantly beyond the weekly deadline.	All of the bibliographic entries and one annotation were turned in after the weekly deadline.
Annotation Authority	You identify the author, their qualifications, their field of expertise, other works, their relationship to others in the field and why or how (or not) they are considered experts in their particular field.	You identify the author, their qualifications, their field of expertise and some of their other works, relationship to others in the field and why or how (or not) they are considered experts in their particular field.	You identify the author and base level qualification but do not go beyond the formal title and institutional home of the author.	You identify the author but no attempt is made to understand the author, author qualifications or relevance of the author to the field.
Annotation Scope & Purpose	You identify, synthesize and clearly articulate the scope, purpose, main arguments and significance of the annotation essay.	You identify and summarize the main points but do not clearly communicate the significance or scope of the essay.	You identify and summarize the content of the essay but miss a major argument or a couple of smaller points. You do not attempt to communicate the significance or scope of the essay.	You attempt a summary but your summary is shallow and not original. Your summary reads like the abstract or a stringing together of headings. Clearly you put in some effort but a very minimal amount.
Annotation Context	You successfully identify and clearly communicate the context from which this essay emerges, the discussion the author is joining and any other sources or literature bases that might be of interest.	You identify and communicate the context from which this essay emerges and the discussion the author is joining. You do not engage any other resources outside of the particular essay.	You identify the context from which the author is writing this essay but do not clearly establish the significance of the context. You mention but only in passing the discussions which the author is joining. You do not engage any other resources outside of the particular essay.	You briefly mention or hint at the context the essay is emerging from or the situation from which the author is replying. You do not address the significance of this context/situation or any outside resources.