**Germany and the Environment**

**Final Project Assignment and Rubric**

For the final project, I would like to have you take something that you have learned from this course, and find a way that it could realistically be applied on campus or in the city of Pella. In the best of all possible worlds, I would like to have a set of fully-formed proposals that I could hand to Mike Lubberden or the mayor of Pella.

These projects may be collaborative in nature, but are not required to be. When working with a group, each person should be able to point to their specific contributions to one or more projects. For example, a German student might work with multiple projects to assist with information-gathering from multiple sources. An environmental studies student might work with more than one project to evaluate environmental impact. A student with business experience might work with more than one project on cost/benefit analysis. For the sake of flow of the proposal, this should probably be summed up in a separate analysis of contribution. These projects should be realistic, and something that can be achieved in a reasonable (i.e. 5-year) time frame. Consider starting small. A solar array on one building within five years is reasonable. Producing all the electricity for campus on a renewable basis by Christmas is not.

This description is vague, and intentionally so. It is my hope that these projects will be creative and dynamic, which makes determining group size or page length impossible. If you were writing a paper, I would probably suggest a length of 8-10 pages. However, you are writing a proposal for a project, which may be longer or shorter, depending on the detail of your project. It is the quality of your work and not the quantity of pages or words that is significant. I am not going to assign groups, and it is up to each student to either find a group to work with, or to develop a topic on their own.

**Grading Rubric:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A | B/C | D/F |
| Style and Mechanics\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 | Fundamentally free of errors. Clearly organized and easy to navigate. Aesthetically pleasant. | Errors in grammar or spelling, but that do not detract from the content. Formatting issues minor. | Major grammar or spelling issues that affect comprehensibility. Formatting that confuses rather than clarifies. |
| Clarity\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 | Proposal makes sense. Major questions answered. If information is missing, proposal acknowledges need for more info. | Proposal is logical, but leaves a few major or many minor questions open. | Proposal is unclear, and many questions remain unaddressed. |
| Soundness of concept\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 | Concept makes sense, given its context. | Concept seems questionable in context. | Concept inappropriate to context. |
| Fiscal issues\_\_\_\_\_ of 20 | Addresses major concerns regarding financing and cost/benefit ratios. | Leaves some fiscal concerns unaddressed. | Does not address fiscal issues. |
| Environmental issues\_\_\_\_\_ of 20 | Addresses questions of environmental impact. | Leaves some questions of environmental impact unaddressed. | Does not address environmental issues. |
| Cultural Issues\_\_\_\_\_ of 20 | Addresses questions of cultural transfer or human component adequately.  | Cultural transfer questions problematic. | Does not address culture. |
| Punctuality\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 | Handed in on or before the due date. | Handed in after the due date, but with instructor approval. | Handed in after the due date without contacting the instructor. |