Rubric: Community Profiles

Criteria	Professional	Experienced	Developing	Novice
Content The information collected during the search	The information gathered sufficiently covered the issue/topic being researched.	Overall, the information gathered adequately covered the issue/topic being researched.	The information gathered was fairly inadequate and left some large gaps in the issue/topic being researched.	The information gathered was completely inadequate.
70 points	The information came from pertinent, legitimate sources.	Most of the information came from pertinent, legitimate sources.	Much of the information came from unreliable or questionable sources.	The information was of poor, unreliable quality.
	The information contained data that could be easily and positively validated.	Most of the information contained data that could be validated.	Some of the information could not be easily validated.	Most of the information could not be validated.
	The information collected was the most current available.	The information collected was, overall, current.	Much of the information was outdated.	The information was so outdated it was no longer relevant.
	Product was grammatically correct, error free, and easy to understand.	Spelling or grammatical errors did not limit understanding of product.	Spelling and grammatical errors were distracting.	Product contained so many spelling and grammar errors that its message was unclear.
	Ideas were expressed clearly in language that was easy to understand.	Ideas were expressed clearly with only a few words difficult to understand.	Both ideas and words required much effort to understand.	Ideas were vague and elusive, and language was difficult to understand.

Rubric: Community Profiles (cont'd)

Criteria	Professional	Experienced	Developing	Novice
Organization The way in which the information is put together 30 points	The information was easy to follow and sequenced logically.	The information was generally easy to follow and sequenced logically.	The information was difficult to follow and/or not well sequenced.	The information was difficult to follow and in random order.
	Information relating specifically to the topic was always clearly identified.	Information relating to the topic was usually identified.	Information relating to the topic was not clearly identified.	Information relating to the topic was not identified at all.
	Main points were clearly summarized.	Main points were usually, but not always, clearly summarized.	Summary of main points was vague.	Main points were not summarized.
	Supporting documentation was complete and clearly labeled.	Supporting documentation was clearly labeled, but some items were missing.	Some supporting documentation was missing, and some was inaccurately labeled.	Supporting documentation was not provided.