

Chemistry CP

Name: _____

Personal Chemistry Project

Section: _____

Have you ever wondered why Shrinkydinks shrink? What makes Chef Paul's hot peppers so hot? Why does aspirin make headaches go away? How does sunscreen prevent sunburns? Why do mosquito repellants work? Chemistry topics permeate our everyday life. At some point in the year, there was probably some chemistry-related question that you were curious about, but we didn't get to it in class. Here's your chance to learn more about a chemistry topic that really interests you.

The goal of this project is to research and present information on a chemistry topic of your own choice. Your task is to create an informative and interesting media presentation on your topic. The presentation may be in the form of a website, a Powerpoint presentation, or a short video. You may work with a single partner, if you wish. (Note: Topics may NOT include weapons of mass destruction, illegal drugs, or explosives. Dr. V. reserves the right to reject project topics that are inappropriate for a school setting.)

Deadlines

You must submit your project topic by **Thursday, May 11**.

You must submit preliminary references by **Wednesday, May 31**.

The final project is due the week of Monday, June 12. Bonus points are available depending on the date the final project is submitted, as summarized below.

Date Submitted	Bonus Points
Monday	5
Tuesday	4
Wednesday	3
Thursday	2
Friday	1

The project will be graded according to the following rubric:

Topic submitted on time	0 not submitted	5 on time
Preliminary references submitted <ul style="list-style-type: none">A minimum of four (4) referencesA hard copy must be submitted for any internet resources usedMinimum of one text reference	0 no references	5 pts 4 references, hard copies for internet sources one text correct format
Presentation is informative (See additional scoring rubrics on back) Be sure to discuss the relevant chemistry (reactions, concepts, applications, etc.)	12 pts	
Presentation is organized (See additional scoring rubrics on back)	12 pts	
Presentation is a well-crafted product (See additional scoring rubrics on back)	6 pts	
Presentation is engaging (See additional scoring rubrics on back)	6 pts	
Appropriate use of illustrations/visuals	0 No illustrations	4 Relevant, useful illustrations throughout

Projects will not be accepted after Friday, June 16th.

Informative (This scale x2)

6: Student work is unusually informative. It contains rich, difficult to find, and/or very useful information. Highly complex material is simplified and made accessible through very effective synthesis. The audience is left with a clear sense of empowerment and/or deeper understanding.

5: Student work is highly informative. It contains rich and useful information distilled into an accessible form. The audience is left with a sense of satisfaction and understanding regarding what has been learned and/or the direction it might provide.

4: Student work is informative. It contains useful information presented in an accessible form. The audience is left with the understanding necessary to proceed with further learning in the area or a sense of initial actions that might be taken.

3: Student work is somewhat informative. It contains material that is somewhat superficial, OR highly complicated and hard to discern OR useful but not easy to use in its current form. The audience is left without a clear sense of what might be done with the information.

2: Student work is not very informative. The material is superficial OR not useful in its current form. It provides little or no guidance to the audience.

1: Student work is uninformative, due to incompleteness, superficiality, or inaccessibility. The audience is left with no guidance or insight.

Organized (This scale x2)

6: Student work is unusually well-organized. Everything comes together. The performance is coherent and fluid: there is a logical and seamless flow, a consistent approach/theme/style, nothing is out of place, and the priorities are clear.

5: Student work is highly organized. The performance is coherent: there is a logical flow, a consistent approach/theme/style, little is out of place, and the priorities are clear.

4: Student work is organized. The performance is mostly coherent: there is an apparent logic, a mostly consistent approach/theme/style, few elements are out of place, and priorities are mostly clear.

3: Student work is somewhat organized. The performance does not quite come together: there are ideas/details/facts/elements of performance that are not pursued or brought together.

2: Student work is not very well organized. The performance does not come together: there are numerous ideas/details/facts/elements of performance that are not pursued or brought together.

1: Student work is disorganized. There is no apparent unity, focus, style, theme, or logic to the performance. Ideas/elements/facts occur at random.

Well-Crafted Product

6: The product is unusually well crafted and rich in informative content. This is work of the highest quality, revealing extraordinary attention to detail; thorough, accurate, and well-organized content; and personal style. The product reveals a mature devotion to doing it until it's done right.

5: The product is well crafted and is based on solid and informative content. This is high-quality, refined work, with close attention to detail and accuracy. There may be one or two minor errors in form or content but these do not detract from the overall sense that the work is successful and carefully put together. The product reflects knowledge of the standards by which the work is judged.

4: The product is polished and the information is clear. This is refined work, with attention to detail and based upon appropriate content (though there may be minor errors). The product reflects knowledge of the standards by which the work is judged.

3: The product is functional and reasonably well crafted. Though the work suggests that the materials were deliberately chosen and put together in an appropriate way, there are a few distracting lapses of quality in form and/or content. The errors suggest either an inadequate inspection of final work or some confusion about the standards by which the work is judged.

2: The product is not well crafted and/or it does not build upon solid control of the material. The work is filled with distracting flaws, rough spots, and/or errors and gaps in content used as well as form. Overall, the product suggests a failure to go much beyond an initial rough draft and/or that there is a lack of knowledge of the standards for the task.

1: The product is poorly put together, incomplete and/or based on inaccurate or inappropriate information. There are numerous errors and gaps in form and content, suggesting that the work is a rough draft, and/or the student does not understand the standards by which the work is judged.

Engaging

6: Student work engages the audience from the very beginning and throughout. This is sophisticated work. The ideas and the way they are communicated maintain the audience's interest. There is unusual flair: The author's voice consistently shines through, as does the author's control over purpose and sensitivity to the audience.

5: Student work engages the audience throughout. The ideas and the way they are communicated consistently maintain the audience's interest. The author's voice is clearly present. The work reveals good control over purpose; the language is consistently clear, complete and logical, and shows sensitivity to the audience.

4: Student work generally engages the audience. Ideas and the way they are communicated generally maintain the audience's interest. The author's voice is present, with occasional lapses into a context-less or bland style. The work generally reveals control over purpose and sensitivity to the audience, with minor lapses.

3: Student work is straightforward, communicated in a competent matter-of-fact style, but only occasionally holds the audience's interest. The work may lack a strong and consistent author voice. There is inconsistent control of the purpose AND/OR the work is insufficiently mindful of the audience.

2: EITHER student work is communicated in a perfunctory matter-of-fact style that does not engage the audience much OR the writing reveals flashes of brilliance side by side with confusing, incomplete, or incoherent language. There is either no discernible author voice or point of view OR there is great inconsistency in the author's voice and style. There is no general control over purpose and audience exhibited in the work.

1: Student work is ineffective and/or incomplete. The language used reflects little control over the genre and the mechanics of communicating for a purpose and audience.