

J463/563: Solutions Journalism – Finding the Four Qualities

Due: Jan. 6

To Do:

Read any two *Seattle Times* Education Lab stories from the link on Canvas.

Annotate both of them electronically for each of the Four Qualities of solutions journalism.

To do this you will need to save your selected stories as PDFs by going to File > Export as PDF (using Safari). Then use Adobe’s Preview app to mark up the stories. (Help: <http://www.howtogeek.com/201519/use-your-mac’s-preview-app-to-merge-split-mark-up-and-sign-pdfs/>.) You will then need to save your annotated version as a new PDF file. Please slug it YourLastName_Four Qualities.

To show the presence of the Four Qualities you will need to highlight areas of text and attach labels as notes. Please address each of the highlighted words on the attached slide, except for “puff piece.”

It’s solutions journalism if it....

Features not just a person, but a **response** to a problem
and **how** it happened

Provides available **evidence** of results, looking at
effectiveness — not just intentions

Produces **insights** that can help others respond, too —
not just inspiration

Discusses **limitations** and avoids reading like a **puff piece**

J463/563: Four Qualities Assignment Rubric

Total points possible: 60 (40 for content and 20 for edits)

- Edits will be graded according to editing scale in syllabus; editing scores will be converted to a 20-point scale. (See next page for synopsis of syllabus.)
- Content will be graded according to the table below.

Content

	High (8-10 pts.)	Mid (4-7 pts.)	Low (0-3 pts.)
Quality 1: Response and how	Thoroughly and thoughtfully highlights both the response and how it occurred	Annotation is not thorough or addresses only the response or the how	Does not highlight both the response and the how
Quality 2: Evidence and effectiveness	Thoroughly and thoughtfully highlights both the evidence for and the effectiveness of the solution	Annotation is not thorough or addresses only the evidence or the effectiveness	Does not highlight both the evidence and effectiveness
Quality 3: Insights	Thoroughly and thoughtfully highlights insights that can help others respond too	Annotation is not thorough	Does not highlight insights
Quality 4: Limitations and non-puffery	Identifies limitations and if possible, non-puffery	Annotation is not thorough	Does not highlight limitations

Editing Criteria

Basic Edit Examples

Spelling error, fragment, missing period, factual error, poor content

Advanced Edit Examples

Wordiness, weak verbs, passive voice, lack of strategic thinking, poor framing, organizational problems, comma placement, lack of parallel structure

I will accept passive voice when the object is the emphasis of the sentence.

A (4.0 or 90-100): Excellent

You can make between zero and three advanced edits. Your work exhibits excellent comprehension and performance.

B (3.0 or 80-89): Above Average

You can make four to seven advanced edits. Your work does not have basic errors.

C (2.0 or 70-79): Meets Minimum Standards

You can make eight to 11 edits (basic, advanced or both). If the work has a basic edit, it starts at a C.

D (1.0 or 60-69): Does Not Meet Standards

You would need to make 12-15 edits (basic, advanced or both). If the work has at least two basic edits, it starts at a D.

F (0.0 or 59 or below): Unacceptable

You need to make at least 16 edits (basic, advanced or both). The work demonstrates unsatisfactory writing mechanics.