

Rubrics for CACAO

Rubric #1: Group Work

A - Thorough Understanding	<ol style="list-style-type: none">i. Consistently and actively works towards group goals.ii. Is sensitive to the feelings and learning needs of all group members.iii. Willingly accepts and fulfills individual role within the group.iv. Consistently and actively contributes knowledge, opinions and skills.v. Values the knowledge, opinions and skills of all group members and encourages their contribution.vi. Helps group identify necessary changes and encourages group action for change.
B - Good Understanding	<ol style="list-style-type: none">i. Works toward group goals without prompting.ii. Accepts and fulfills individual role within the group.iii. Contributes knowledge, opinions and skills without prompting.iv. Shows sensitivity to the feelings of others.v. Willingly participates in needed changes.
C - Satisfactory	<ol style="list-style-type: none">i. Works toward group goals with occasional prompting.ii. Contributes to the group with occasional prompting.iii. Shows sensitivity to the feelings of others.iv. Participates in needed changes, with occasional prompting.
D - Needs Improvement	<ol style="list-style-type: none">i. Limited understanding.ii. Works toward group goals only when prompted.iii. Contributes to the group only when prompted.iv. Needs occasional reminders to be sensitive to the feelings of others.v. Participates in needed changes when prompted and encouraged.
F - Unacceptable	<ol style="list-style-type: none">i. Did not participate in group work.

Rubric #2: Mechanics and Quality of the Annotations & Incorporation of Feedback

A - Excellent	<ol style="list-style-type: none">i. Annotations are formatted correctly and are complete.ii. Annotations are made using the first occurrence of evidence.iii. Short descriptions show clear understanding of experimental method/evidence.iv. GO term selected is the most appropriate for the evidence cited, the evidence term is appropriate for the methods used, the reference chosen includes the actual data (not a reference to another paper or the abstract), the experiment described provides the evidence for the chosen GO term, the optional fields are also filled in correctly (if necessary).v. Upon challenges, annotation is well defended using clear logic and appropriate explanations of evidence.vi. Feedback from coaches, judges or instructors is incorporated rapidly and appropriate changes are made to annotations quickly.
B - Very Good	<ol style="list-style-type: none">i. Annotations are formatted correctly and are complete.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Short descriptions show clear understanding of experimental method/evidence. iii. GO term selected is not the most appropriate, but is only a single (parent or child) relationship away from the most appropriate term. iv. Upon challenges, an annotation is defended using clear logic, but explanation lacks some detail(s). v. Feedback from coaches, judges or instructors is incorporated rapidly and appropriate changes are made to annotations quickly.
C - Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Annotations are formatted correctly and are complete. ii. Simple explanation of evidence given. iii. GO term selected is not the most appropriate and is more than a single parent/child relationship away from the most appropriate term. iv. Upon challenges, an annotation is defended, but the explanation lacks important details. v. Feedback from coaches, judges or instructors is incorporated and appropriate changes are made to annotations with occasional prompting.
D - Needs Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Annotations are incorrectly formatted, incomplete or inaccurate. ii. Annotations are made using the wrong evidence code. iii. GO term selected is not relevant to the evidence described. iv. Upon challenges, an annotation is not well defended due to a lack of understanding of evidence or annotation logic. v. Feedback from coaches, judges or instructors is incorporated and appropriate changes are made to annotations when prompted and encouraged.
F - Unacceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Annotations were not added to GONUTS. ii. Upon challenges, an annotation is not defended. iii. Did not incorporate feedback from coaches, judges or instructors and appropriate changes are not made to annotations.

Rubric #3: Knowledge Integration & Application Through Challenges

A - Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Challenge was well-organized, comprehensive and persuasive. ii. Demonstrates full knowledge of the annotation and evidence. iii. Presents a logical explanation for the challenge. iv. Presents an easy-to-follow argument that is logical and adequately detailed. v. Presents an excellent (see above rubric) for alternative annotation.
B - Very Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Challenge is well-organized. ii. Presents most of the arguments against the annotation but lacks some details. iii. Presents a very good (see above rubric) for alternative annotation.
C - Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Challenge is appropriate. ii. Features of the argument lack important detail or does not present sufficient logic. iii. Presents a satisfactory (see above rubric) for alternative annotation.
D - Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Challenge is disorganized or illogical.

Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">ii. Presents basic background to the annotation, but does not adequately describe the problem to be solved.iii. Presents a needs improvement (see above rubric) for alternative annotation.
F - Unacceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Challenge is vague, confusing or obviously inappropriate.ii. Argument is poorly contrived or neglects obvious problems with the annotation.iii. Does not present an alternative annotation.

