Rubric: Superhero Profiles

Criteria	Professional	Experienced	Developing	Novice
Content The information communicated by the superhero profiles 50 points	☐ The superhero profiles gave clear, comprehensive descriptions of the different superheroes.	☐ The superhero profiles gave a clear description for the most part, but some items needed clarification.	☐ The superheroes' descriptions were difficult to follow/understand.	☐ Some or all of the superheroes' descriptions were missing.
	Meaningful supporting details regarding the superheroes' powers, garb, and equipment were provided.	☐ A few details regarding the superheroes' powers, garb, and/or equipment were unclear but did not distract from the overall quality of the profiles.	☐ Some information regarding the superheroes' powers, garb, and/or equipment was vague.	☐ Information regarding the superheroes' powers, garb, and/or equipment was missing.
	☐ The connection of each superhero to his/her corresponding business function was logical and very clear.	☐ The connection of each superhero to his/her corresponding business function was mostly logical and clear.	☐ The connection of each superhero to his/her corresponding business function was questionable and/or difficult to discern.	Little or no effort was made to demonstrate the connection of each superhero to his/her corresponding business function.
Organization The flow of text, graphics, and pictures; the way in which the profiles were put together 25 points	☐ Coordinated elements aided in communicating a clear, straightforward, specific description of each superhero.	☐ Coordinated elements communicated a general description of each superhero.	☐ Elements lacked coordination but did not interfere with description of each superhero.	□ Elements lacked coordination, hampering the creators' efforts to describe each superhero.

Rubric: Superhero Profiles (cont'd)

Communication Skills	☐ Superhero descriptions were expressed clearly in language that was easy to understand.	☐ Superhero descriptions were expressed clearly with only a few words being difficult to understand.	☐ Super hero descriptions required much effort to understand.	Superhero descriptions were vague and elusive, and language was difficult to understand.
Ability to express oneself so as to be understood by others 25 points	☐ Profiles were grammatically correct and free of punctuation, spelling, and capitalization errors.	☐ Profiles were free of grammar and spelling errors; punctuation and capitalization errors did not limit understanding of descriptions.	☐ Profiles' spelling and grammatical errors were distracting.	Profiles contained so many spelling, grammar, punctuation, and capitalization errors that the descriptions were hard to understand.

Rubric: "What If?" Scenario

Criteria	Professional	Experienced	Developing	Novice
The information that was communicated to the audience	☐ Superheroes' actions were entirely plausible, given the roles and responsibilities of their corresponding business functions.	☐ Superheroes' actions made sense for the most part, given the roles and responsibilities of their corresponding business functions	Superheroes' actions were questionable, given the roles and responsibilities of their corresponding business functions	☐ Little or no effort was made to make superheroes' actions plausible, given the roles and responsibilities of their corresponding business functions.
50 points	Meaningful supporting information was provided for each key point.	Unsupported information did not limit understand-ability of students' work.	☐ Some information was vague or unsupported by evidence.	☐ Information was vague and lacked supporting evidence.
Organization How the information	☐ Students' work was structured with a definite beginning, middle, and end.	☐ Beginning, middle, and end were present but not clearly identified.	☐ Beginning, middle, or end was difficult to discern.	☐ Beginning, middle, or end was missing.
was put together; the flow of the "What If?" scenario comic book, video, skit, etc. 25 points	☐ The main points were logical with points building on each other.	☐ The main points were generally easy to follow and logical.	☐ The main points were logical but difficult to follow.	☐ The main points were so difficult to follow that their logic could not be determined, or they were illogical.
·	☐ Introduction engaged audience and identified purpose of the students' work.	☐ Introduction was interesting and provided partial explanation of what the students' work was about.	☐ Standard introduction was presented and hinted at purpose of students' work.	☐ Introduction was uninteresting and did not identify the purpose of students' work.
	☐ Material was suited to the media (e.g., comic book, video, etc.) used.	☐ Material was fairly well suited to the media used.	☐ Content appeared to be stretched or omitted to fit the media used.	☐ Too much or too little information was presented due to the media used.
	☐ Students' work came to a suitable conclusion with main points summarized.	☐ Conclusion was satisfying, but not all main points summarized.	☐ Conclusion seemed unsatisfying, or main points were vague.	Students' work ended abruptly without a conclusion or summary of key points.
	Meaningful supporting information was provided for each key point.	Unsupported information did not limit understand-ability of students' work.	☐ Some information was vague or unsupported by evidence.	☐ Information was vague and lacked supporting evidence.

Rubric: "What If?" Scenario (cont'd)

Criteria	Professional	Experienced	Developing	Novice
Communication Skills	☐ Students' work was expressed clearly in language that was easy to understand.	☐ Students' work was expressed clearly with only a few words being difficult to understand.	☐ Students' work required much effort to understand.	Students' work was vague and elusive, and language was difficult to understand.
Ability to express oneself so as to be understood by others 25 points	☐ Students' work was grammatically correct and free of punctuation, spelling, and capitalization errors.	☐ Students' work was free of grammar and spelling errors; punctuation and capitalization errors did not limit understanding.	☐ Spelling and grammatical errors in students' work were distracting.	Students' work contained so many spelling, grammar, punctuation, and capitalization errors that it was hard to understand.