

Cryptography Paper #3 (Practical Crypto)

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

| Component      | Poor<br>(1 point)  | Acceptable<br>(2 points)  | Good<br>(3 points)   | Excellent<br>(4 points)   | Score |
|----------------|--|---|--|---|-------|
| <i>Content</i> |  |   |  |   |       |
| Relevance      | No attempt is made to establish why the topic might be important to a college student.         | The paper gestures to the importance of the topic to a college student, but doesn't offer any reasons why.                      | The paper offers one clear and compelling reason why the topic is important and should matter to a college student.                    | The paper offers more than clear and compelling reason why the topic is important and should matter to a college student.   |       |
| Practicality   | No practical advice for today's college student is offered in the paper.                       | The paper offers general advice for protecting one's privacy, but the advice is abstract and would be hard to follow.           | The paper offers some concrete advice for protecting one's privacy that a college student could follow.                                | The paper offers concrete advice for protecting one's privacy with clear steps a college student could follow.  |       |
| Trade-Offs     | No acknowledgement of potential trade-offs that might come with following the provided advice. | The paper acknowledges potential trade-offs that might come with following the provided advice, but in a vague or abstract way. | The paper identifies one or more legal, ethical, practical, or personal trade-offs that might come with following the provided advice. | The paper identifies legal, ethical, practical, or personal trade-offs that come with following the provided advice, and evaluates the costs of those trade-offs. |       |
| Organization   | There's very little organization to the paper.   | There's some organization to the paper, but the parts don't fit together in conceptually meaningful ways.                       | The paper is organized in a conceptually useful manner.  | The paper's organization is conceptually useful and helps keep the reader's interest throughout the paper.  |       |
| Use of Sources | Few, if any, claims are supported with scholarly sources.                                      | Scholarly sources used are used appropriately, but many claims are unsupported.   | Most significant claims (evidence, arguments made by others) are supported with scholarly sources.                                     | All significant claims (evidence, arguments made by others) are well supported with scholarly sources.  |       |

| Component               | Poor<br>(1 point)   | Acceptable<br>(2 points)   | Good<br>(3 points)  | Excellent<br>(4 points)   | Score |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|---|-------|
| <i>Clarity</i>          |   |  |   |   |       |
| Clarity of Arguments    | The arguments made for the relevance of the topic would be difficult for fellow students to follow.   | The arguments made for the relevance of the topic would make at least some sense to fellow students.                                       | The arguments made for the relevance of the topic would be mostly clear to fellow students.   | The arguments made for the relevance of the topic would be very clear to fellow students.                                       |       |
| Clarity of Evidence     | The examples, stories, etc. presented as evidence are described in a way that fellow students would not be able to understand.  | The examples, stories, etc. presented as evidence would make at least some sense to fellow students.                                       | The examples, stories, etc. presented as evidence would be mostly clear to fellow students.   | The examples, stories, etc. presented as evidence would be very clear to fellow students.                                       |       |
| Accessibility           | The explanation of the mechanics of the paper's topic would be difficult to follow for college students without cryptography backgrounds.                                   | The explanation of the mechanics of the paper's topic would make at least some sense to college students without cryptography backgrounds. | The explanation of the mechanics of the paper's topic would be mostly clear to college students without cryptography backgrounds.   | The explanation of the mechanics of the paper's topic would be very clear to college students without cryptography backgrounds. |       |
| Cryptography Connection | It's not clear why this paper was written for a course on cryptography.   | There's a connection between cryptography and the paper topic, but this connection isn't made explicit.                                    | The paper draws an explicit connection between cryptography and the paper topic, but is unclear about the kind of information being kept secret or the people from whom it's kept secret. | The paper clearly identifies for its topic what kind of information is being kept secret from whom.                             |       |
| Voice                   | The student's voice sounds entirely artificial (e.g. using words the student is not likely to understand) and/or inappropriate to academic writing (e.g. far too informal). | The student's voice generally sounds natural and appropriate to academic writing, with the exception of a few weak spots.                  | The student's voice sounds natural, approachable, knowledgeable, and authoritative, but occasionally dry.   | The student's voice sounds natural, approachable, knowledgeable, and authoritative, without being dry.                          |       |

| Component                             | Poor<br>(1 point)  | Acceptable<br>(2 points)   | Good<br>(3 points)  | Excellent<br>(4 points)   | Score |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|-------|
| <b>Presentation</b>                   |  |  |   |   |       |
| Web Style                             | The length of paragraphs and formatting of the paper would make it a very hard online read.      | The paper generally follows common Web style guidelines, with some weak spots (e.g. overlong paragraphs here and there). | The paper follows common Web style guidelines: shorter paragraphs, useful section headings, use of lists where appropriate.                 | The paper follows common Web style guides and also includes useful images and/or links to useful external resources.      |       |
| Mechanics                             | So many grammatical, punctuation, or spelling mistakes that it's hard to keep reading the paper. | Several grammatical, punctuation, or spelling mistakes—enough to slow down one's reading of the paper several times.     | A few grammatical, punctuation, or spelling mistakes—nothing that would slow down one's reading of the paper for more than a second or two. | At most, only a couple of grammatical, punctuation, or spelling mistakes—nothing that impedes one's reading of the paper. |       |
| References                            | References and/or citations are poorly formatted, and it's unclear how references were used.     | References and citations are appropriately formatted, but it's unclear how those references were used.                   | It's reasonably clear how references were used, but references and/or citations are inappropriately formatted.                              | References are appropriately formatted, and citations make clear how those references were used.                          |       |
| <b>Total Score</b> (out of 52 points) |  |  |   |   |       |

Comments: