

JUS 375 Journal Two Rubric

Overview: Journals in this course are private between the student and the instructor. Approach these activities as (a) an opportunity to reflect upon and apply what you learn each week based on the assigned readings, discussions, and activities, and (b) an opportunity to share your knowledge and expertise based on your educational and professional experiences in the past. As a successful professional, you will need good reflective and writing skills. Journal activities offer you the opportunity to further develop these skills.

Prompt: Read [Report to the Attorney General on Delays in Forensic DNA Analysis](#). Then write a journal assignment in which you answer the following questions:

- Should DNA testing be mandatory in all cases where DNA is collected? Why or why not? Do you agree with the report’s findings?
- From the report, which recommendation would you prioritize, if you were given the opportunity to implement it within your state or department? Why?

Refer to your textbook and relevant scholarly sources to support the points and observations made in your journal assignment.

Guidelines for Submission: Your journal assignment must be 300–400 words (excluding the references). Citations should be formatted according to APA style. Submit assignment as a Word document with double spacing, 12-point Times New Roman font, and one-inch margins.

Critical Elements	Exemplary (100%)	Proficient (85%)	Needs Improvement (55%)	Not Evident (0%)	Value
Reflections on Mandatory DNA Testing	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and the evaluation provides clear and persuasive reasoning	Evaluates the extent to which DNA testing should be mandatory in cases where DNA is collected, exploring the pros and cons and affirming stance	Affirms stance on mandatory DNA testing but lacks logical explanation of both pros and cons	Does not affirm stance or address mandatory DNA testings	30
Recommendation Priorities	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and stance is further supported with local justifications or anecdotes	Identifies priorities in implementing recommendations and logical supporting explanation	Identifies priorities in implementing recommendations but lacks supporting explanation	Does not identify priorities in implementing recommendations	30

Southern New Hampshire University

Incorporation of Evidence and Scholarly Resources	Meets “Proficient” criteria, and the synthesis of sources is especially well supported, cogent, and insightful	Analysis of evidence from text and scholarly sources is logical, well supported, and of appropriate depth and complexity	Analysis of evidence from text and scholarly sources is illogical and/or not well supported or lacks appropriate depth and complexity	Does not include any evidence from text and scholarly sources to support the points and observations	30
Articulation of Response	Meets “Proficient” criteria and has excellent syntax and sentence construction	Submission has no major errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization	Submission has major errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization that negatively impact readability and articulation of main ideas	Submission has critical errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization that prevent understanding of ideas	10
Earned Total				100%	