

Water Quality Reconnaissance Rubric

	Expert	Proficient	Emerging	Novice
A. Observations Are Detailed and Consistent	4. Describes many observed practices with many specific and relevant details.	3. Describes a few observations with a few details for each. Descriptions relate generally to each question.	2. Describes a couple of observations. Provides few details. Some descriptions are incomplete or confusing.	1. Describes one or no observations. Gives no details, or details are not relevant.
B. Record of Observations Is Accurate	4. Describes all observations precisely and with no errors. May use evidence from multiple sources to corroborate observations.	3. Describes observations with a high degree of precision and with no errors.	2. Describes observations with few or no errors. Some descriptions may be vague.	1. Descriptions contain obvious errors, or are incomprehensibly vague.
C. Ranking of Priorities Is Well-Reasoned and Well-Supported	4. Reasons for rankings are thorough, relevant and logical. Accurately cites experts and/or concrete evidence for each conclusion. Evidence is clearly relevant and supports conclusions.	3. Explains reasons for rankings. Accurately cites experts or evidence for conclusions. Relevance of some evidence is not immediately clear.	2. Reasons for rankings are unclear or inconsistent. Though accurate, some evidence is not relevant or does not support reasons for rankings.	1. Gives no rankings, gives no reasons for rankings, or evidence obviously contradicts rankings.

Water Quality Reconnaissance Rubric (continued)

	Expert	Proficient	Emerging	Novice
D. Report Is Well-Organized	<p>4. Sections appear in logical and effective order. Each section makes a clear, logical transition into the next. The report includes a brief summary. Thoroughly explains findings and recommendations. Report includes complete citations of evidence and experts. Materials are neat and attractively formatted. Maps, pictures, and diagrams directly enhance related text. Text is grammatical and free of misspellings or typos.</p>	<p>3. Sections appear in an understandable order. The report includes a summary and citations of evidence and/or experts. Materials are orderly. Maps, pictures, and diagrams may be effective on their own, but are not mentioned in text. Text is grammatical and free of misspellings or typos.</p>	<p>2. Text is understandable, yet lacks a clear and effective order. Lacks summary or citations of evidence. Maps, pictures, and diagrams have nothing to do with accompanying text. Text may contain some grammatical, spelling, or typing errors.</p>	<p>1. Text is not broken into sections. Text is ungrammatical, with misspellings and typos. Elements are missing. Materials are messy. There may be no accompanying graphics.</p>
E. Presentation Is Clear and Effective	<p>4. The main findings and recommendations are clearly stated. The presentation follows a logical order. Attractive audiovisuals provide detail and/or explain specific points. Answers to questions are respectful, thorough, and to the point. Speakers are consistently loud and easy to understand. Clothes and grooming are appropriate to the audience.</p>	<p>3. The presentation states recommendations and important findings. It has a clear beginning and ending. Audiovisuals enhance the presentation. Answers to questions are respectful and complete. Speakers are understandable most of the time. Clothes and grooming are appropriate.</p>	<p>2. The presentation makes a point, but may wander some, or be incomplete and therefore not clear or correct. Audiovisuals may not relate to the rest of the presentation or are not explained. Answers to questions are polite but confusing or incomplete. Speakers sometimes mumble. Clothing and grooming are appropriate.</p>	<p>1. The presentation wanders with no apparent purpose. Audiovisuals are poorly made, or there are none. Does not answer questions or is not respectful of questioners. Speakers are hard to understand. Clothing and grooming are inappropriate to the audience.</p>