Plastic Policy Proposal Brochure: Checklist and Rubric

Name

Date

PROJECT CHECKLIST

___ Definition of the problem of plastic in the world, including why we should care about working to solve the problem

___ At least four facts to support the definition

___ Proposed new policy or policy change

___ Summary of data analysis to support the proposed policy

___ At least five pieces of evidence to support the proposed policy

___ Summary of policymaker analysis, including who controls the policy and the process for change at that level

___ Reference list

	Emerging Social Scientists	**Apprentice Social Scientists**	**Proficient Social Scientists**	**Feedback**
Definition of Problem **D4.6.6-8.** Define the problem of plastic pollution, its impacts on your community, and other communities in the world. Explain the challenges and opportunities people have faced when trying to address the problem using at least four facts to support your statement.	• The problem is poorly defined. • Facts to support the case for change are missing, or connections are weak.	• The problem of plastic pollution is defined clearly. • Facts support the case for change, but may not be sufficient.	• The nature and scope of the problem of plastic pollution are clearly explained, and the case is made for change. • Four or more facts summarized from the unit's resources support the statement.	
Solution Proposal **D4.1.6-8.** Propose a solution to plastic waste in our community, supported by data from your research. Summarize your data analysis, present findings, and acknowledge limitations.	• The proposed solution is not a policy change. • Supporting data is missing or misrepresented.	• The proposed policy change is stated. • Data is presented but lacks sufficient analysis.	• The proposed policy change is clearly described. • Data is analyzed, and a summary of the findings is clearly communicated in a way that argues in support of the proposal. • Limitations of the data are acknowledged.	
Supporting Evidence **D3.3.6-8**. Include at least five pieces of evidence that support the proposal. Attach a reference list.	• Evidence lacks detail and connection to the claims. • References are missing.	• Evidence is used to support the proposal but is from a single source, or the connections between the evidence and the claims are weak. • References are present.	• Five or more pieces of evidence from multiple sources are presented in detail with clear connections to support the proposal. • A reference list is attached and in the required format.	

	Emerging Social Scientists	Apprentice Social Scientists	Proficient Social Scientists	Feedback
Policymaker Analysis **D4.7.6-8.** Provide a summary of a policymaker analysis for the implementation of the proposed solution. This should state who controls the policy, and what process is used for change.	• Policymaker analysis summary is unclear and does not lead to any conclusions about which organizational level makes the most sense for implementation.	• Policymaker analysis is described briefly and states which level will be the best choice for implementation.	• Summary of policymaker analysis is a clear assessment of how the proposed policy would be implemented at various organizational levels, and which level it is a viable option for.	
Presentation **D4.3.6-8.** Present your proposal in two formats – in a brochure, and orally to the class. Organize and adapt each to the appropriate audience.	• The proposal brochure has poor organization and does not meet all of the criteria from the description. • Oral presentation lacks clarity and is not supported by the content of the proposal.	• The presentation of the proposal brochure meets the criteria from the assignment description. • Organization is unclear. • Oral presentation uses the brochure to present the argument clearly but consists primarily of reading the text directly from the brochure.	• The presentation of the proposal brochure is clear, professional, and attractive, and meets all of the criteria from the description. • The oral presentation leverages points from the brochure, extending and adapting arguments in response to panel questions.	