

Learning outcome	Highly developed 4	Developed 3	Emerging 2	Initial 1
<p>Student identifies keywords of invention's features and functions.</p> <p>Weight: 15%</p>	<p><i>Keywords are thorough, varied, demonstrate sophisticated brainstorming, and accurately describe the invention.</i></p> <p>Identifies a variety of keywords that broadly and narrowly describe the features and functions of the invention. Keywords include both common and technical terms. Keywords illustrate the purpose of the invention, components of the design, and how it is used.</p>	<p><i>Keywords are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth.</i></p> <p>Identifies adequate number of keywords but keywords, overall, may be too broad or too narrow. Some keyword elements may be ignored or unaccounted for.</p>	<p><i>Keywords used are inadequate.</i></p> <p>Identifies basic keywords that accurately represent the invention, but are inadequate in searching for prior art.</p>	<p><i>Keywords are absent or are irrelevant to the search.</i></p> <p>Keywords are absent or keywords provided do not accurately represent the invention.</p>
<p>Student demonstrates understanding of search strategy and information retrieval.</p> <p>Weight: 35%</p>	<p><i>Search strategy demonstrates expertise and skillful understanding of the methodology.</i></p> <p>Identifies multiple Cooperative Patent Classifications (CPC) that are highly related to the invention. Search log is organized, thorough, complete, and demonstrates a skillful understanding of the methodology.</p>	<p><i>Search strategy demonstrates proficient understanding of the methodology.</i></p> <p>Identifies Cooperative Patent Classifications (CPC) that are related to the invention, but may overlook other CPCs that could be relevant. Search log is complete but may lack organization or ignore some elements.</p>	<p><i>Search strategy demonstrates a weak understanding of the methodology.</i></p> <p>Identifies Cooperative Patent Classifications (CPC) that are somewhat related to the invention. Search log significantly lacks organization, or ignores critical elements.</p>	<p><i>Search strategy demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology.</i></p> <p>Does not identify Cooperative Patent Classifications (CPC) or identifies CPCs that are not related to the invention. Search log is incomplete and/or demonstrates a misunderstanding of the methodology.</p>
<p>Student effectively evaluates results and synthesizes information.</p> <p>Weight: 40%</p>	<p><i>Patent analysis is thorough, well-documented, and detailed.</i></p> <p>Analysis is thorough and includes review of drawing sheets, specification, claims, references cited, and cited classifications. Analysis demonstrates sophisticated understanding of legal issues and relationships between patents. Relationship between patents and invention is clear and well-defined.</p>	<p><i>Patent analysis is adequate but may have some gaps.</i></p> <p>Analysis is well-constructed but may have some gaps. Analysis demonstrates some understanding of legal issues and relationships between patents. Relationship between patents and invention is discussed accurately.</p>	<p><i>Patent analysis is present but poorly structured or lacking in detail.</i></p> <p>Analysis is poorly structured and/or lacking in detail. Analysis demonstrates poor understanding of legal issues and relationships between patents. Relationship between patent and invention is unclear or poorly discussed.</p>	<p><i>Patent analysis is incomplete or inaccurate.</i></p> <p>Analysis is incomplete or inaccurate. Analysis does not demonstrate understanding of legal issues or relationships between patents. Relationship between patent and invention is not discussed or inaccurate.</p>
<p>Student demonstrates professional writing and communication.</p> <p>Weight: 10%</p>	<p><i>Narrative is coherent, clear/concise, and formatted correctly with little to no mechanical errors.</i></p> <p>The narrative is coherent and structured, allowing the reader to follow the thread of the discussion. Sentences are structurally correct and succinct. There are very little or no errors in grammar, punctuation, or spelling.</p>	<p><i>Narrative is mostly coherent, clear/concise, and formatted correctly, with few mechanical errors.</i></p> <p>The narrative is mostly coherent and structured, with some weak or unclear areas. A few sentences are structured incorrectly or wordy. There few errors in grammar, punctuation, or spelling.</p>	<p><i>Narrative is mostly incoherent, unclear/wordy, and has many mechanical errors.</i></p> <p>The narrative is poorly structured. Many sentences are structured incorrectly or wordy. There are errors in grammar, punctuation, or spelling that can become distracting for the reader.</p>	<p><i>Narrative is incoherent, unclear/wordy, and has a problematic number of mechanical errors.</i></p> <p>The narrative structure is poor as to make the main idea in most sections incoherent. Sentences are awkward, poorly structured, or wordy. There are many errors in grammar, punctuation, or spelling that impact the reader's understanding of the document.</p>