Written Paper Scoring

Total of 90 Points

Evaluation Criteria		Advanced (15 pts)	Proficient (10-14 pts)	Developing (4-9 pts)	Beginning (0-3 pts)
Substance	**Purpose:** Student understands the subject matter.	Clearly identifies the main issues, recognizes related subordinate concerns, and accurately explains their relationships.	Identifies the main problem clearly but may not fully understand the relationship between subordinate concerns.	Identifies the problem/issue vaguely or incompletely and/or confuses main and subordinate concerns.	Identifies the problem/issue inaccurately and does not adequately consider subordinate concerns.
	Position: Thesis, hypothesis, perspective.	Clearly states a relevant position, considering the subject's context and complexity.	States a clear position that is relevant to the problem/issue under consideration.	States a position with context but may be purely descriptive.	No position is offered, the position is simplistic or obvious, or the position is inaccurate.
	Sources/Additional Positions: Student considers context and the perspectives of others.	Includes additional sources (beyond ASCE Code of Ethics) and uses relevant sources ethically and accurately, providing context and supporting their position.	Includes additional sources (beyond ASCE Code of Ethics) that are used accurately.	Includes few additional sources (beyond ASCE Code of Ethics) whose perspectives are relevant to the topic.	Relies only on the ASCE Code of Ethics or weak sources, with minimal or inaccurate engagement.
	Analysis and Arguments:	Provides a clear, well-reasoned analysis and argument based on evidence and perspectives.	Presents a reasoned interpretation of the information; interpretation may not be supported by the information presented.	Presents a synthesis of the information; interpretation is absent or unsupported.	Analysis and arguments are limited in quantity and may contain clearly erroneous logic.
Written Communication	**Organization:** How well the writing advances ideas using compelling and relevant narratives.	The document is well-structured; smoothly segues from one part to another (e.g., introduction, body, and conclusion) to effectively convey the writer's ideas.	The document is adequately structured but choppy at times with minor impact on the communication of ideas.	The document's structure is awkward, impeding effective communication of ideas.	The document lacks the structure to convey the writer's ideas.
	Clarity and Grammar: How well the writing uses grammar tools to communicate.	Writing poses no obstacles to comprehension with no errors; displays a mastery level of the written word.	Writing poses no obstacles to comprehension, containing few to no errors; displays a proficiency with the written word.	Writing contains some errors but does not impede overall understanding; displays adequate grasp of the written word.	Writing contains many errors; impeding the overall understanding; displays inadequate grasp of the written word.

Oral Presentation Scoring

Total of 90 Points

	Evaluation Criteria	Advanced (15 pts)	Proficient (10-14 pts)	Developing (4-9 pts)	Beginning (0-3 pts)
Content	**Ability to Communicate Key Concepts**	The Presenter communicates the key concepts from their paper in a clear and concise manner that allows the audience to easily understand the importance of the topic and their arguments.	The Presenter communicates some of the key concepts from their paper in a semi-clear manner. Audience can understand the importance of the topic and their arguments, but may have some issues piecing the argument together.	Concepts from their paper are unclear or vague.	Concepts from paper are nonexistent.
	Positions	Positions are clear and arguments are well-developed and well-understood	Positions are somewhat developed.	Positions are not well developed.	Positions are not clear
Execution and Delivery	**Delivery Style**	The Presenter was able to engage the audience. It appeared well practiced and did not appear that the presentation was memorized. Limited references to notes or presentation. Presenter used technical language correctly.	The Presenter was able to engage the audience most of the time. It appeared mostly practiced. Limited use of notes or referring to the presentation. Presenter used technical language correctly most of the time.	The Presenter was able to engage the audience. It appeared that the presentation was memorized or that they were reading off a paper or screen. Presenter did not use technical language correctly.	The Presenter did not engage the audience and read from a paper or screen.
	Personal Bearing	The Presenter had great professionalism, energy, and showed excitement to present. Presenter made eye contact, projected their voice, and was poised.	The Presenter was professional, energetic, or excited to present. Presenter made some eye contact, and was poised.	The Presenter was professional but not energetic or excited to present. No eye contact or was difficult to hear.	No eye contact, was difficult to hear, or was not poised.
Q&A	**Answers**	Answers show understanding of the questions critical thinking.	Answers show understanding of the questions and are relevant.	Answers show some understanding and may stray from relevance.	Answers are off-topic/irrelevant.
	Delivery: Answers are confident, clear, and to the point	Always	Most of the time.	Some of the time.	Limited