

Concept Map Grading Sheet

Name:

Cmap:

Date:

Score: x 5 = / 90

Level:

CRITERION # 1: Concept relevance and completeness

- 0 pts. - The map contains very few concepts and/or most concepts are irrelevant, redundant or not well-defined (e.g., “characteristics” instead of “physical characteristics”); additionally, there is an excessive use of examples (one third or more of the map’s concepts are examples).
- 1 pts. - One half or more of the map’s concepts are relevant and well-defined, but **many important concepts are missing**; and/or there is an excessive use of examples (one third or more of the map’s concepts are examples).
- 2 pts. - Most concepts are relevant and well-defined, but **some important concepts are missing**. Appropriate use of examples (less than a third of the map’s concepts are examples).
- 3 pts. - All concepts are relevant and well-defined; **no important concepts are missing**. Appropriate use of examples (less than a third of the map’s concepts are examples).

CRITERION # 2: Propositions as “semantic units” (e.g. CONCEPT + LINKING PHRASE + CONCEPT)

- 0 pts. - Author does not understand how to construct propositions (very few propositions are well constructed).
- 1 pts. - Author understands somewhat how to construct propositions (some propositions are well constructed).
- 2 pts. - Author understands how to construct propositions (all or almost all propositions are well constructed).

CRITERION # 3: Erroneous propositions - Misconceptions

- 0 pts. - The map contains more than 2 erroneous propositions.
- 1 pts. - The map contains 1-2 erroneous propositions.
- 2 pts. - The map contains no erroneous propositions.

CRITERION # 4: Dynamic propositions (simply not stating a definition)

- 0 pts. The map contains no dynamic propositions of any kind.
- 1 pts. The map contains only non-causative dynamic propositions (not cause-effect related)
- 2 pts. The map contains 1-2 causative dynamic propositions with **physically separate links**.
- 3 pts. The map contains more than 2 causative dynamic propositions with **physically separate links**.
- 4 pts. The map contains quantified (change in one cause change in other) causative dynamic propositions.

CRITERION # 5: Quantity and quality of cross-links

- 0 pts. The map contains cross-links, but they are all erroneous (false).
- 1 pts. The map contains no cross-links.
- 2 pts. The map contains cross-links and these establish correct (true), meaningful relationships. However, they are redundant or not particularly relevant or adequate.
- 3 pts. The map contains 1-2 correct, relevant and adequate cross-links with **physically separate links**. However, based on the concepts present in the map, important and/or evident cross-links are missing.
- 4 pts. The map contains more than 2 correct, relevant and adequate cross-links with **physically separate links**. However, based on the concepts present in the map, important and/or evident cross-links are missing.
- 5 pts. The map contains more than 2 correct, relevant and adequate cross-links with **physically separate links**. Based on the concepts present in the map, no important or evident cross-links are missing.

CRITERION # 6: Presence of cycles, a directed circuit in which the direction of the arrows allows traversing the entire closed path in a single direction

- 0 pts. The map contains no cycles.
- 1 pts. The map contains at least 1 cycle, but some propositions in the cycle do not satisfy criterion # 2.
- 2 pts. The map contains at least 1 cycle and all propositions in the cycle satisfy criterion # 2.