

Eastern Mennonite University / Center for Justice & Peacebuilding

Spring 2011; January 10-14

PAX 624

Monitoring & Evaluation

Instructor:

Mark M. Rogers

markmrogers@hotmail.com

Tel. (360) 734-2702

Course Description:¹

This is an introductory monitoring and evaluation course for peacebuilding practitioners and professionals. It assumes that participants are already familiar with the theory and practice of peacebuilding but not monitoring and evaluation. The course approaches monitoring and evaluation from a learning perspective and introduces theories of change, indicators, monitoring, evaluation design, and tools for reflective practice. Its objectives are to enable participants to think evaluatively, design better projects, to monitor and learn from those projects more regularly and effectively, and to enable participants to engage with final evaluations more thoroughly. The course design includes mini-lectures, experiential learning exercises and practical case applications. The course is offered either for training or for one, two or three hours of MA credit. For students taking the course for credit, there are additional requirements.

Students are invited to submit a 5-7 page case study of a peacebuilding project to be used in the practicum sessions involving indicator development, monitoring planning and evaluation design. The cases should include a detailed conflict analysis, a goal statement, SMART objectives, targeted results and brief descriptions of the key activities. Two to four case studies will be chosen according to participant interest.

Course Objectives:

1. To acquire tools for analysis, reflection and learning that add value to peacebuilding practice.
2. To understand the basic concepts and activities involved in monitoring and evaluating peacebuilding initiatives.
3. To develop skills in evaluative thinking.
4. To develop and practice skills that are important for monitoring and evaluating projects, such as indicator development and evaluation planning.

¹ This course syllabus includes segments of training curriculum we have utilized in various workshops. We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of colleagues Reina Neufeldt, Hal Culbertson, Cheyanne Church, Carla Fajardo, Susan Hahn, John Paul Lederach, Grace Ndugu and Jean Baptiste Talla, in the development of various materials and ideas over time.

Required Texts:

The following references will be used for this course and are available on-line:

Carver, Christopher, and Rolf Sartorius. *Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning for Fragile States and Peacebuilding Programs*. Social Impact/ Office of Transition Initiatives (OTT), 2005.

Church, Cheyanne, and Mark M. Rogers. *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. Search for Common Ground/United States Institute of Peace (USIP), 2006. (available on-line in two parts at:

<http://www.sfcg.org/documents/manualpart1.pdf> ;

<http://www.sfcg.org/documents/manualpart2.pdf>

Lederach, John Paul, Reina Neufeldt and Hal Culbertson. *Reflective Peacebuilding: A Planning, Monitoring and Learning Toolkit*. The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame and Catholic Relief Services (CRS), 2007. (available on-line at: http://kroc.nd.edu/documents/crs_reflective_final.pdf).

Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *Guidance on Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities: working draft for application period*. DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation and the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 2008.

Course Reader (to be distributed in class)

Recommended Reading:

A bibliography of articles and books related to the design, monitoring and evaluation of peacebuilding projects is attached. Students will be required to draw on these and other relevant materials in their written assignments for the course.

Course Requirements:

In this course, we will engage in a mix of applied work, lectures and discussions in which everyone is expected to participate as a basic core course requirement. Everyone is expected to read required readings and periodically prepare overnight assignments.

Additional Course Requirements (for credit students):

1. *Self appraisal of class participation (2-3 pages)*. Required for 1, 2, and 3 credits (35% of grade for three credits) Each student will develop criteria of effective classroom participation (indicators), set participation standards against which to compare their data, collect and use both quantitative and qualitative data to assess their performance, rank their own performance and describe the evidence to support their findings. You will need to begin collecting data on the first day of the workshop. Parts of this exercise can be done in pairs or small groups.

2. *Critical reflection papers* (2 pages each)

a.) Required for 2 and 3 credits. (15% of grade for three credits)

Given this course is designed to increase the reflective capacities of practitioners, you are required to write a short paper that analytically reflects on course readings for a particular module of material (e.g. indicators, monitoring, evaluation, theories of change).

b.) Additionally required for 2 credits only. Critique a professionally prepared, external peacebuilding evaluation of your choice. Identify the strengths and weakness of the evaluation. How is the evaluation useful? Discuss at least one alternative you might have pursued had you been on the evaluation team.

3. *Evaluation Project Proposal* (16-20 pages) Required for 3 credits only (50% of grade for three credits).

Students will develop an evaluation proposal outlining a particular conflict context and a project including the design an evaluation. The paper should include a justification of the focus of the evaluation and proposed methods of evaluation and methods of analysis, drawing on resources from the bibliography. The analysis of the conflict and the justification of the evaluation approach must include references and citations and should not exceed three pages.

Class Schedule:

Day One

Key Issues: What is evaluative thinking? How do we describe the changes peacebuilding seeks to realize?

Read for Class:

- Confronting War, Part I, Chapters 1 and 2 (pp.7-19)
<http://www.cdainc.com/publications/rpp/confrontingwar/ConfrontingWar.pdf>
- Reflective Peacebuilding, Chapters 1, 5 and 6 <http://kroc.nd.edu/toolkitforpeacemakers.shtml>
- Frameworkers and Circlers article www.berghof-handbook.net/uploads/download/neufeldt_handbook.pdf

Bring to class: Completed survey on M&E; proposed case studies.

Time	Content
8:30 – 10:15	Introductions Overview of the course Key Topics (lecture and discussion): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Purposes of monitoring and evaluation
10:30-12:15	(Key topics continued) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Learning as a discipline for peacebuilders to develop – <i>Re-mystify practice</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting up small work groups • Case Study Selection
1:15-3:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluative thinking – Cookies anyone?
3:30-5:30	Understanding and Observing Change – <i>De-mystify theory</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Types of Change • Dimensions of change • Theories of Change

Day Two

Key Issues: How do we know that changes are happening? What do indicators “indicate?”

Read for Class:

- Reflective Peacebuilding, Chapter 7
- Designing for Results, Chapters 2 and 4
- Most Significant Change, Chapter 1

Time	Content
8:30-10:15	Indicators of Change <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defining indicators • Exercise – developing indicators
10:30-12:15	Indicators of Change continued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testing indicators • Exercise: Using data to inform program decisions
1:15-3:15	Practicum
3:30-5:30	Learning from stories –Enhancing reflective capacities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stories of change • Analysis and interpretation

Day Three

Key Issues: What does monitoring mean? When is monitoring a peacebuilding intervention? How can we take a monitoring-as-learning approach?

Read for Class:

- Designing for Results, Chapter 6
- Reflective Peacebuilding, Chapter 11
- Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning for Fragile States and Peacebuilding Programs

Time	Content
------	---------

8:30-10:15	Monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exercise: coin toss • Monitoring as learning
10:30-12:15	Monitoring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observation • Documentation
1:15-3:15	Monitoring as a peacebuilding intervention
3:30-5:30	Methods of Analysis Monitoring Practicum

Day Four

Key Issues: What does evaluation mean? How do we structure the terms of reference for an evaluation? How do we structure an evaluation plan? How do we take an evaluation-as-learning approach?

Read for Class:

- Aid for Peace, Chapter 5
- Designing for Results, Chapter 7, 8
- OECD-DAC Guidance on Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities

Time	Content
8:30 – 10:15	Distinguishing between M&E Evaluation Design Choices
10:30-12:15	Evaluation Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation as Learning • Developing the Terms of Reference
1:15-3:15	Evaluation Design Practicum
3:30-5:30	Evaluation Design Practicum continued...

Day Five

Key Issues: How do we work with external evaluators? What ethics are important to consider in monitoring and evaluation? How do we translate experience into knowledge?

Read for Class:

- Designing for Results, Chapter 9 and 11
- Reflective Peacebuilding, Chapters 2, 3, 12 and 13
- Organisational Learning in NGOs <http://www.intrac.org/pages/PraxisPaper3.html>

Time	Content
8:30 – 10:15	Managing External Evaluators Evaluation Ethics
10:30-12:15	Working with qualitative data
1:15-3:15	Reflective Peacebuilding The Proverbial Walk
3:30-5:30	Wrap-up – what have we learned? Written evaluation of the course

Criteria for Evaluating Papers

	<i>Self-appraisal</i>	<i>Reflection</i>	<i>Evaluation Design</i>
Demonstration of evaluative thinking	√	√	√
Use and development of evaluation criteria	√		√
Use and development of performance standards	√		√
Attention to context and relevance	√	√	√
Articulation of theories of change and assumptions		√	√
Overall coherence of evaluation design	√		√
Internal validity of indicators	√		√
Framing of evidence	√		
Strength of findings and conclusions	√	√	
Use of references and resources			√

Bibliography

A. Peacebuilding Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning

Anderson, Mary B., and Lara Olson. *Confronting War: Critical Lessons for Peace Practitioners*. Cambridge: The Collaborative for Development Action (CDA), Inc., 2003.
<http://www.cdainc.com/publications/rpp/confrontingwar/ConfrontingWar.pdf>

Bush, Kenneth, PhD. “A Measure of Peace: Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) of Development Projects in Conflict Zones.” Working Paper No. 1, The Peacebuilding and Reconstruction Program Initiative & The Evaluation Unit, International Development Research Centre (IDRC).

Carver, Christopher, and Rolf Sartorius. *Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning for Fragile States and Peacebuilding Programs*. Social Impact/ Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI), 2005.

Church, Cheyanne, and Julie Shouldice. *The Evaluation of Conflict Resolution Interventions: Framing the State of Play*. International Conflict Research (INCORE), 2002.

———. *The Evaluation of Conflict Resolution Interventions-Part II: Emerging Practice and Theory*. INCORE, 2003.

Church, Cheyanne, and Mark M. Rogers. *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programs*. Search for Common Ground/United States Institute of Peace (USIP), 2006.

Cohen, Craig. *Measuring Progress in Stabilization and Reconstruction*. USIP, 2006.

Fast, Larissa A., and Reina C. Neufeldt. “Envisioning Success: Building Blocks for Strategic and Comprehensive Peacebuilding Impact Evaluation.” *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development*, Vol. 2, no. 2 (2005): 24-41.

Lederach, John Paul, Reina Neufeldt and Hal Culbertson. *Reflective Peacebuilding: A Planning, Monitoring and Learning Toolkit*. The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame and Catholic Relief Services (CRS), 2007.

Neufeldt, Reina C. “Frameworkers” and “Circlers” – *Exploring Assumptions in Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment*. Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, 2007.
www.berghof-handbook.net/uploads/download/neufeldt_handbook.pdf

Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *Encouraging Effective Evaluation of Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities: Towards DAC Guidance*. DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation and the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, Sept. 2007. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/14/24/39341279.pdf>

Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *Guidance on Evaluating Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities: working draft for application period*. DAC Network on Conflict, Peace and Development Co-operation and the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 2008.

Paffenholz, Thania and Luc Reyhler. *Aid for Peace: A Guide to Planning and Evaluation for Conflict Zones*. Nomos, 2007.

B. General Information on Monitoring and Evaluation

Bamberger, Michael, Mary Church, Lucia Fort, and Jim Rugh. “Shoestring Evaluation: Designing Impact Evaluations under Budget, Time and Data Constraints.” *American Journal of Evaluation* 25, no. 1 (2004): 5–37.

Dart, Jessica and Rick Davies. *The ‘Most Significant Change’ (MSC) Technique: A Guide to Its Use*. Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE) Inc., et al., 2005.

- Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Working Party on Aid Evaluation. *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 2002.
- Miles, Mathew and Michael Huberman, *Qualitative Data Analysis, an Expanded Sourcebook*. Second Edition, Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, 1994.
- Patton, Michael Quinn, *Developmental Evaluation: Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use*, The Guildford Press, New York, 2010.
- Patton, Michael Quinn. *Utilization-Focused Evaluation: The New Century Text*, 3rd edition. Sage Publications, 1996.
- Stake, Robert E. *Qualitative Research: Studying How Things Work*. The Guildford Press, New York, 2010.
- Taleb, Nassim Nicholas, *The Black Swan: The Impact of the Highly Improbable*. Random House, New York, 2010
- Yarbrough, Donald B. *et.al.*, *The Program Evaluation Standards: a Guide for Reviewers and After Action Review Users*. 3rd. Edition. Sage: Thousand Oaks, California, 2010.

C. General Information on Program Design

- AusAID. *AusGuideline 3.3 The Logical Framework Approach*. Australian Government, 2005.
<http://www.ausaid.gov.au/ausguide/pdf/ausguideline3.3.pdf>
- European Commission. *Aid Delivery Methods, Volume 1: Project Cycle Management Guidelines*. European Commission, 2004.
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/multimedia/publications/documents/tools/europeaid_admin_guidelines_2004_en.pdf
- DFID. *DFID Tools for Development*. Department for International Development (DFID), United Kingdom, 2002. <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/toolsfordevelopment.pdf>
- Stetson, Val, Guy Sharrock and Susan Hahn. *ProPack: The CRS Project Package*. Baltimore: CRS, 2004.
http://crs.org/publications/pdf/Gen0904_e.pdf
- Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, *10 Principles to Ensure Successful Use of Evaluations*, SDC, Bern, undated, www.deza.admin.ch/ressources/resource_en_91087.pdf
- U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) Center for Development Information and Evaluation. "USAID Tips on Monitoring and Evaluation." USAID Center for Development Information and Evaluation, volume 11 (1997).

D. Additional Resources

- Bengtson, Bjorn, Ivar Evensmo, Joakin Gundel, Barbro Ronnmo, Dan Smith, and Hilde Henriksen Waage. *Assessment of Lessons Learned from Sida Support to Conflict Management and Peacebuilding*. http://www.sida.se/?d=118&a=2433&language=en_US
- Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management. *Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation*. Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, 2005. <http://www.berghof-handbook.net/>
- Britton, Bruce. *Learning for Change: Principles and Practices of Learning Organizations*. Swedish Mission Council, 2002.
- Britton, Bruce. "Organisational Learning in NGOs: Creating the Motive, Means and Opportunity" *Praxis Paper 3*. Oxford UK: INTRAC, 2005. <http://www.intrac.org/pages/PraxisPaper3.html>
- Earle, Lucy (2002). "Lost in the matrix: The logframe and the local picture." Paper presented for INTRAC's 4th Evaluation Conference. <http://www.intrac.org/docs.php/790/Earle.pdf>
- Faulkner, Fernande, and Brian Foster. *Managing Learning at the Field Level in the Humanitarian Sector*. New York: Eriksen, Faulkner, Foster, 2004. [http://reliefweb.int/rw/rwt.nsf/db900SID/LHON-632MC4/\\$File/ALNAP_May2004_Learning_in_Field.pdf?OpenElement](http://reliefweb.int/rw/rwt.nsf/db900SID/LHON-632MC4/$File/ALNAP_May2004_Learning_in_Field.pdf?OpenElement)
- Garfinkel, Renee. "What Works? Evaluating Interfaith Dialogue Programs." Special Report 123. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 2004. <http://www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/sr123.html>
- Nairobi Peace Institute (NPI)-African and the National Council of Churches of Kenya Community Peace Building and Development Project (NCKK-CPBD). *Strategic and Responsive Evaluation of Peacebuilding: Toward a Learning Model*. Kenya: NPI-African and the NCKK-CPBD Project, 2001. <http://www.npi-africa.org/viewdocument.asp?ID=7>
- Ross, Marc Howard. "Action Evaluation in the Theory and Practice of Conflict Resolution." *Peace and Conflict Studies*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (2001). <http://www.gmu.edu/academic/pcs/Ross81PCS.htm>
- Ramalingam, Ben and Harry Jones, with Toussaint Reba and John Young. "Exploring the Science of Complexity: ideas and implications for development and humanitarian efforts. *Working Paper 285*. United Kingdom: Overseas Development Institute, 2008. [http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/lib.nsf/db900SID/OCHA-7C3N5E/\\$FILE/ODI-Science%20of%20Complexity-Feb2008.pdf?OpenElement](http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/lib.nsf/db900SID/OCHA-7C3N5E/$FILE/ODI-Science%20of%20Complexity-Feb2008.pdf?OpenElement)
- Reason, Peter. "Choice and Quality in Action Research Practice." *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol. 15, no. 2 (2006): 187-203.
- Reason, Peter and Hilary Bradbury. Eds. *Handbook of Action Research*. London: Sage, 2001.
- Rothman, Jay. "Action Evaluation." *Beyond Intractability*. Eds. Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess. Conflict Research Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder. Posted: October 2003 http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/action_evaluation/

Supplemental information for CJP graduate course syllabi:

Approved 3/20/06; updated 1/11

Writing Guidelines:

Writing will be a factor in evaluation: EMU has adopted a set of writing guidelines for graduate programs that include four sets of criteria: content, structure, conventions and style (see below). It is expected that graduates will be able to write at least a “good” level with 60% writing at an “excellent” level.

For the course papers, please follow the APA style described in CJP’s *GUIDELINES for GRADUATE PAPERS* (see student handbook or request a copy from the Academic Program Coordinator).

Academic Integrity Policy (AIP):

EMU faculty and staff care about the integrity of their own work and the work of their students. They create assignments that promote interpretative thinking and work intentionally with students during the learning process. Honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility are characteristics of a community that is active in loving mercy, doing justice, and walking humbly before God. EMU defines plagiarism as occurring when a person presents as one’s own someone else’s language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source. (Adapted from the Council of Writing Program Administrators). [Taken from “Academic Integrity,” 2010-11 Undergraduate Catalog.] This course will apply EMU’s AIP (see catalog, pp. 16-19) to any events of academic dishonesty. For more information see <http://www.emu.edu/academic-support/writing/academicintegritypolicy03-09.pdf> If you have doubts about what is appropriate, one useful website is <http://www.indiana.edu/~istd/>

Grading Scale & Feedback:

Grades will be based on an accumulation of numerical points that will be converted to a letter grade at the end of the course. Each assignment will receive a score expressed as a fraction, with the points received over the total points possible (e.g. 18/20). The following is the basic scale used for evaluation. *Points may be subtracted for missed deadlines.*

95-100 = A outstanding	90-94 = A- excellent
85-89 = B+ very good	80-84 = B good
75-79 = B- satisfactory	70-74 = C passing
Below 70 = F failing	

Graduate students are expected to earn A’s and B’s.
A GPA of 3.0 is the minimum requirement for graduation.

Regarding feedback on papers/projects: Students can expect to receive papers/assignments back in a class with faculty feedback before the next paper/assignment is due. This commitment from faculty assumes that the student has turned the paper in on the agreed upon due date.

Institutional Review Board:

All research conducted by or on EMU faculty, staff or students must be reviewed by the Institutional Review Board to assure participant safety: <http://www.emu.edu/irb/>

Academic Support Center & Disability Support Services:

If you have received services in the past related to a learning disability or attention deficit disorder and/or you feel you may have such a problem in this course, please make an appointment to speak with the faculty member or with the Coordinator of Student Disability Support Services in the Academic Support Center, third floor of the Hartzler Library (432-4254).

Please take advantage of the free individual tutoring from writing tutors. Writing tutors are strong writers who hold scheduled one-on-one sessions with students and are an excellent resource for writers at any level or at any stage in the writing process. Please remember that writing tutors do not provide editing or proofreading services. They will help you put what you learn into practice and will work with you to improve your own proofreading and editing skills. To make an appointment, please visit the Academic Support Center on the 3rd floor of the Sadie Hartzler Library.

Class Attendance:

Students are expected to attend all class meetings. If unusual or emergency circumstances prevent class attendance, the student should notify the professor in advance if possible. Multiple absences from class will result in lower grades. The student is responsible for the material presented in classes missed. (EMU Graduate Catalog)

Students should be aware of the importance of regular class attendance, particularly in the case of CJP classes that meet weekly or over several weekends. Being absent for more than one class leads to a student missing a large portion of the class content. In addition to consistent class attendance, students should make every effort to arrive to class on time out of respect for the learning process, fellow students and faculty.

Course Extensions and Outstanding Grades:

For Fall and Spring semesters, all coursework is due by the end of the semester. If a student will not be able to complete a course on time, the student must submit a request one week before the end of the semester for an extension (up to 6 months) using a course extension form provided by the Academic Program Coordinator. If the request is granted the student will receive an "I (incomplete)" for the course which will later be replaced by a final grade when the work has been turned in on the agreed upon date. If the request for an extension is denied, the student will receive a grade for the work that has been completed up until the time the course was expected to have been completed. If no work has been submitted, the final grade will be an F (or W under certain circumstances).

Extensions will be given only for legitimate and unusual situations. Extensions are contracted by the student with the program for up to a maximum of 6 months after the deadline for the course work. PLEASE NOTE: If the outstanding course work is received within the first 6 weeks of the extension, no grade reduction will be imposed; after 6 weeks any outstanding coursework will be reduced by ½ letter grade. If the extension deadline is not met, the student will receive a final grade for the work completed.

Under exceptional circumstances, an additional 6-month extension may be granted by special petition to the CJP academic committee. To receive this additional extension, a letter of petition is expected with full rationale for the reason unable to finish to this point and a practical plan on how the student will actually finish if this extension is permitted. This must be submitted at least 1 week before the end of the first extension. A student is encouraged to use this only when absolutely necessary.

Writing Standards –Graduate Level (Grid Version)

Criteria	A excellent	B minimal expectations	C below expectations	Comments
Content <i>(quality of the information/ ideas and sources/ details used to support them)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - shows clarity of purpose - shows depth of content - applies insight and represents original thinking -demonstrates quality and breadth of resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - shows clarity of purpose - shows substantial information and sufficient support - almost always represents original thinking - uses quality resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - shows clarity of purpose - lacks depth of content and may depend on generalities or the commonplace - represents little original thinking - uses mostly quality resources 	
Structure <i>(logical order or sequence of the writing)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is coherent and logically developed - uses very effective transitions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is coherent and logically developed - uses smooth transitions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is coherent and logically (but not fully) developed - uses some awkward transitions 	
Style <i>(appropriate attention to audience: effective word choice, sentence variety, voice; appropriate level of formality for academic writing vs. informal text messages and email)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is concise, eloquent, and rhetorically effective - composes varied sentence structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - displays concern for careful expression - composes some varied sentence structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - displays some personality <u>but</u> lacks imagination and may be stilted - composes little varied sentence structure - frequently uses jargon and clichés 	
Conventions <i>(adherence to grammar rules: usage, mechanics)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - composes well-constructed sentences -makes virtually no errors in grammar and spelling - makes accurate word choices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - almost always composes well-constructed sentences - makes minimal errors in grammar and spelling - makes accurate word choices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - usually has well-constructed sentences - makes several errors - makes word choices that distract the reader 	
Source Integrity <i>(appropriate acknowledgment sources used in research)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cites sources for all quotations - composes credible paraphrases, cited correctly - includes reference page - makes virtually no errors in documentation style 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cites sources for all quotations - composes credible paraphrases, usually cited correctly - includes reference page - makes minimal errors in documentation style 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - cites sources for all quotations - composes mostly credible paraphrases, sometimes cited correctly - includes reference page - makes several errors in documentation style 	
<p>The weighting of each of the five areas is dependent on the specific written assignment and the teacher's preference. Plagiarism occurs when a person presents as one's own "someone else's language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source" (adapted from Council of Writing Program Administrators).</p>				Grade

Approved by University Faculty

April 28, 2004

Revised by the Writing Committee

April 2008

Updated March 2009