

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 #2 Kadynce Sanders

Thanks for submitting SA #2, Kadynce, this is a remarkably well done SA. You note that these are case studies in how re-thinking or re-framing knowledge and uses of plants is an important path for the Garden to follow. I also like your observation that the publications themselves often skew once again towards “WEIRD” in terms of authorship. This can also be thought of in the context of the CODES experience. You are new authors, new voices, encouraging an institution like the Missouri Botanical Gardens, to tell new narratives that focus in on knowledge and skills of other peoples, other communities.

The bibliographies look good!