

Rubric for both email & disciplinary referral in *Who Tagged the Bench?*

	Needs Revision to Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations
Making claims about who tagged the bench.	Claims do not relate to central task of activity or are otherwise inappropriate.	Claims are vague but overall appropriate given the stage of the activity (part 1 or part 2).	Claims are clear, concise and appropriate given the stage of the activity (part 1 or part 2).
Using evidence from investigations to support claims.	Does not provide evidence from class investigations to support claims.	Attempts to provide evidence from class investigations. Some evidence may not be appropriate.	Provides sufficient evidence to support claims given state of activity (part 1 or part 2).
Justification that evidence is appropriate to support claims. (Reasoning)	Does not provide justification that links evidence with claims. Repeats evidence.	Justification attempts to link evidence with claims.	Justification includes strong logic and use of scientific principles.
Comments:			

Notes: This rubric is modified from McNeill and Krajcik 2008. The same rubric is used for both the email and disciplinary referral as each include the same components. Using the same rubric for both Part 1 and Part 2 of the activity allows students to gain familiarity with it. As it is used in both parts of the activity, the nature of these elements will change as students collect additional evidence and refine their claims.