

HIS 693: Relatable World History Project

Criteria	Needs Improvement	Competent	Proficient
Planning Assignments (Formative Assessments)			
Outline & Bibliography	<p>0-5 points</p> <p>Sources are not appropriate (ie unapproved internet sources. No annotations. Displays rudimentary or incomplete understanding of Chicago Style</p>	<p>6-8 points</p> <p>Uses appropriate sources, missing or incomplete annotations. Displays basic understanding of Chicago Style.</p>	<p>9-10 points</p> <p>Appropriate sources and detailed annotations. Displays advanced understanding of Chicago Style.</p>
Research Meeting	<p>0-1 points</p> <p>Did not meet</p>	<p>2-3 points</p> <p>Met, but student did not prepare materials or met after the assigned module</p>	<p>4-5 points</p> <p>Met with prepared materials</p>
Research Plan	<p>0-5 points</p> <p>Did not complete a research plan for the project</p>	<p>6-8 points</p> <p>Outline is incomplete or does not include clear plan for research and digital tools. Topic is unclear.</p>	<p>9-10 points</p> <p>Complete outline of project, clear topic and plan for research & digital tools</p>
Final Product (Summative Assessment)			
Historiography	<p>0-5 points</p> <p>Little to no evaluation of historians' use of the analytical lens in world history scholarship.</p>	<p>6-8 points</p> <p>Some evaluation of historians who have applied this lens in world history</p>	<p>9-10 points</p> <p>Well-supported overview of world historians who have applied this analytical lens</p>
Relatable World History Analysis	<p>0-10 points</p> <p>Analysis incomplete. Does not reference primary and secondary source material. Lacks global focus</p>	<p>11-17 points</p> <p>Analysis superficial or unclear. Infrequently references primary and secondary source materials.</p>	<p>18-20 points</p> <p>Clear connections to primary and secondary sources. World History analysis clearly presented.</p>
Sources/ Bibliography	<p>0-5 points</p> <p>Sources are not appropriate (ie unapproved internet sources), contains few or no references, no bibliography. Does not use Chicago Style.</p>	<p>6-8 points</p> <p>Uses appropriate sources, contains references and bibliography but does not use Chicago Style.</p>	<p>9-10 points</p> <p>Appropriate sources and correct Chicago Style formatting for any notes and bibliography.</p>
Organization and Style	<p>0-9 points</p> <p>Project design is cluttered or unorganized. Writing is not clear and at times confusing or hard to follow. Transitions are awkward. Missing or incorrect quotations.</p>	<p>10-13 points</p> <p>Project design generally organized and appropriate for product. Writing is generally clear and concise but has some awkward or confusing sections. Quotations are not properly contextualized.</p>	<p>14-15 points</p> <p>Strong overall project design and excellent application to the product. Writing is clear and concise. Quotations are properly contextualized, and transitions are smooth.</p>
Grammar and Spelling	<p>0-9 points</p> <p>Numerous spelling or grammatical errors. Informal or passive voice throughout.</p>	<p>10-13 points</p> <p>Contains some spelling or grammatical errors that take away from the project. Some passive voice</p>	<p>14-15 points</p> <p>Few spelling or grammatical errors.</p>
Peer Review	<p>0-1 points</p> <p>Did not turn in peer review</p>	<p>2-3 points</p> <p>Peer review superficial or incomplete</p>	<p>4-5 points</p> <p>Constructive peer review submitted</p>