CODE 122: Source Analysis Benchmarks

Here are some benchmarks or goals that you should keep in mind as you create your Source Analyses. I will use these as I provide feedback and evaluation. I'm looking not only at how you perform on any one individual Source Analysis, but also how you demonstrate growth in this area across the semester.

Criterion	Novice Level	Competent Level	Proficient Level
Source ID	Does not fully cite or identify the source. Makes no connections between the source and community partner.	Fully identifies the source, but does not use an established bibliographic citation style, for example, MLA or APA. Makes connections between the source and community partner.	Fully identifies the source and uses (without error) established citation style. Makes connections between the source and community partner.
Context	Analysis is missing information about the creator, the time of creation, its intended audience, or its format.	Analysis contains some discussion about the creator, time of creation, intended audience and format, but some areas are incomplete or inaccurate.	All of the context pieces are present, and they are discussed in full.
Summary	Analysis is missing some or most of the important facts about the source's content. As a rule of thumb: A good summary is about 25% of the length of the original source. Or else if there is more than one source, not all are included.	Analysis contains most of the important facts about the source's content (all sources if more than one is assigned), but some areas are incomplete or inaccurate. A good summary is about 25% of the length of the original source.	All important facts about the source are covered. A good summary is about 25% of the length of the original source.
Analysis	Analysis is missing the argument contained in the source. Analysis contains insufficient main takeaways. A good analysis may be longer than a summary.	Analysis contains most or all of the argument or main takeaways, but some of this is still missing or inaccurate. A good analysis may be longer than a summary.	Analysis contains all of the main takeaways, and these are fully developed. A good analysis may be longer than a summary.
Grammar/Style	Several grammatical errors, over-use of "passive voice", lack of clarity or specificity in presentation.	Few grammatical errors or over-use of "passive voice", a better sense of clarity and specificity in presentation.	No (or virtually no) grammatical errors. Presentation is clear, precise, and specific to the assignment.
Formatting & Presentation	Does not make use of a bibliographic formatting style in source ID and overall presentation has serious or repeated issues.	Makes use of a bibliographic formatting style in source ID and the overall presentation is neat and organized, with only some issues.	Makes full and accurate use of a bibliographic formatting style in source ID and the overall presentation is neat and organized.

Notes for SA #4: Jay Alcin

Thanks for submitting your SA #4, Jay.

You have a good summary of the CritQuant piece. I'd like to see more work with your analysis. Why do you think this article matters to our group? What connections do you see? One obvious link is that this CODES group is actually engaging in the very methodological approach (qualitative methods) that this article is recommending. And we are also doing this with the aim of addressing social inequalities and injustices.

Likewise, I like your summary of the TEK YouTube video, but I'm also looking for more substance to your analysis. What are the connections betweent his video and the work that CODES is trying to do with the Gardens? How can the Garden better honor Indigenous knowledge/TEK within the confines of its space and the plants and plant materials that it holds in collection?

The bibliogrphies look good.