## 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                    | <b>Competent Level</b>       | Proficient Level         |
|---------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Source ID     | Does not fully cite or identify | Fully identifies the source, | Fully identifies the     |
|               | the source. Makes no            | but does not use an          | source and uses          |
|               | connections between the         | established bibliographic    | (without error)          |
|               | source and community            | citation style, for example, | established citation     |
|               | partner.                        | MLA or APA. Makes            | style. Makes             |
|               |                                 | connections between the      | connections between      |
|               |                                 | source and community         | the source and           |
|               |                                 | partner.                     | community partner.       |
| Context       | Analysis is missing             | Analysis contains some       | All of the context       |
|               | information about the           | discussion about the         | pieces are present, and  |
|               | creator, the time of creation,  | creator, time of creation,   | they are discussed in    |
|               | its intended audience, or its   | intended audience and        | full.                    |
|               | format.                         | format, but some areas are   |                          |
|               |                                 | incomplete or inaccurate.    |                          |
| Summary       | Analysis is missing some or     | Analysis contains most of    | All important facts      |
| ,             | most of the important facts     | the important facts about    | about the source are     |
|               | about the source's content.     | the source's content (all    | covered. A good          |
|               | As a rule of thumb: A good      | sources if more than one is  | summary is about 25%     |
|               | summary is about 25% of the     | assigned), but some areas    | of the length of the     |
|               | length of the original source.  | are incomplete or            | original source.         |
|               | Or else if there is more than   | inaccurate. A good           | 011 <b>g</b> 50 012 01   |
|               | one source, not all are         | summary is about 25% of      |                          |
|               | included.                       | the length of the original   |                          |
|               | moradea.                        | source.                      |                          |
| Analysis      | Analysis is missing the         | Analysis contains most or    | Analysis contains all of |
| •             | argument contained in the       | all of the argument or main  | the main takeaways,      |
|               | source. Analysis contains       | takeaways, but some of       | and these are fully      |
|               | insufficient main takeaways.    | this is still missing or     | developed. A good        |
|               | A good analysis may be          | inaccurate. A good           | analysis may be longer   |
|               | longer than a summary.          | analysis may be longer       | than a summary.          |
|               | j                               | than a summary.              | ,                        |
| Grammar/Style | Several grammatical errors,     | Few grammatical errors or    | No (or virtually no)     |
| ,             | over-use of "passive voice",    | over-use of "passive         | grammatical errors.      |
|               | lack of clarity or specificity  | voice", a better sense of    | Presentation is clear,   |
|               | in presentation.                | clarity and specificity in   | precise, and specific to |
|               |                                 | presentation.                | the assignment.          |
| Formatting &  | Does not make use of a          | Makes use of a               | Makes full and accurate  |
| Presentation  | bibliographic formatting        | bibliographic formatting     | use of a bibliographic   |
|               | style in source ID and overall  | style in source ID and the   | formatting style in      |
|               | presentation has serious or     | overall presentation is neat | source ID and the        |
|               | repeated issues.                | and organized, with only     | overall presentation is  |
|               | *                               | some issues.                 | neat and organized.      |

## Notes for SA #1 Kadynce Sanders

Thanks for submitting this, Kadynce, and for being a discussion leader. The summaries look quite good. I appreciate your bringing in direct quotes and noting that while Linnaeus was attempting something to benefit science (and "racism" as a concept wasn't even a thing at that time), his legacy has been damaging nonetheless. Also, in the bird re-naming piece, the author wonders whether simply re-naming a species will actually be enough to repair the damaging history, or whether it may in fact cause more complications. So, she's raising an issue here that reparation types of activities have to proceed carefully and mindfully.

I'd like to see your analysis link a bit more up with the work we are doing with our Garden partners. For example, if we identify additional names or functions of plants, what does that help to solve? What other complications can it raise?

The bibliographies are there, but thre is a bunch of extra information there that shouldn't be there. I'm guessing that you fed the Blackboard link into Zoterobib, and so it captured the Blackboard metadata. If you are not sure what goes into this, then please stop by my office hours and I'd be happy to demonstrate that for you.