

Unit 3 Capstone - Grading Rubric

50 points total		4 = Excellent	3 = Satisfactory	2 = Marginal	1 = Unacceptable
Max. pts	Content				
4	Topic selection	Specific policy problem explicitly linked to climate change/Covid-19, and to one SDG	Specific policy problem linked to climate change/Covid-19, and to one SDG, but connection not explicit	Specific policy problem linked to EITHER climate change/Covid-19 OR to one SDG	Difficult to find link between topic and Covid-19/Climate change and to SDG
2	Executive summary	Clear stand-alone summary, relevant info included	Adequate summary of policy issue and potential solutions	Partial or vague summary of policy issue	No executive summary
6	Statement of problem/ background	Specific, clear problem stated, motivated and supported with outside sources	Problem stated, motivated with some sources	Problem stated but inadequately motivated, marginally related to prompt	Problem is unclear or never stated, minimal use of sources, does not address prompt
2	Audience	Audience's interest in problem clearly stated, brief tailored to audience	Brief appropriate to audience, but interest not clearly stated or not well thought out	Brief poorly linked to audience's interests	Brief broadly inappropriate to audience
6	Pre-existing policies/evidence	Concise description of related pre-existing policies or evidence, sourced appropriately	Limited discussion of related pre-existing policies, or extraneous policies included	Minimal discussion of related pre-existing policies	No discussion of related pre-existing policies
4	Academic evidence	At least 3 peer-reviewed academic articles to support motivation and/or discussion of evidence/policies. At least 6 sources total	Missing 1 academic article or 1-2 non-academic sources	Missing 2 academic articles or missing 3-4 total sources	No academic articles included
4	Policy options	2-3 relevant policy options, advantages/disadvantages, with clear policy recommendation	Policy options unclear or not fully thought out, policy recommendation not fully justified or supported	Policy options listed but not explained, or unrelated options, Policy recommendation stated, but unclear and/or with no justification	No discussion of policy options or advantages/disadvantages, no recommendation

50 points total		4 = Excellent	3 = Satisfactory	2 = Marginal	1 = Unacceptable
8	Critical thinking and accuracy	Key proposal elements reflect critical thinking and understanding of issues. Statements and claims are factually accurate	Demonstrates some independent and critical thinking and understanding of issues, or some minor inaccuracies	Limited evidence of independent and critical thinking, or major inaccuracies	Minimal evidence of independent/critical thinking, or major inaccuracies undermine entire brief
2	References	All references cited appropriately and consistently in text and in references section	References cited inconsistently, some references missing	Minimal use of citations when needed, incomplete reference section	No reference section
Appearance and style					
4	Writing style and organization	Clear and easy to read, well organized	Awkward or wordy writing, clear planning, some areas out of place	Readable but difficult to follow, organizational issues impede understanding	Difficult to understand
4	Grammar	Few grammatical and typographical errors	Some errors, but do not impede understanding	Moderate grammatical errors/typos	Frequent errors impede understanding
4	Appearance	Attractive policy brief appropriate for policy audience, appropriate use of boxes, graphics, and pull-quotes	Easy to read but largely unformatted document	Largely unformatted document that makes finding points difficult	Sloppy appearance, unprofessional

Note: Additional points will be deducted if the brief does not meet the main assignment criteria: about a challenge in a low- or middle-income country that is tied to a sustainable development goal and exacerbated by COVID-19 or climate change.