

HCOL 185 FINAL PAPER RUBRIC (122 points)					
Item	Points	Excellent (100%)	Adequate (80%)	Marginal (60%)	Poor (40%)
RESEARCH PAPER (72 POINTS)					
Abstract	2	Descriptive title, abstract that summarizes paper entirely (accurately and stands alone) within word count	Descriptive title, abstract that summarizes most of paper but may miss key results, or is above/below word count	Either title is not descriptive/present, or abstract only covers main topic of paper but not results	Title is not descriptive/present or abstract is missing
Introduction	6	Introduction includes all four elements as described, meets outside sources requirement (2 peer-reviewed, for 3 total). Introduction presents well-supported, cohesive narrative that motivates research question using sources and summarizes paper contributions	Introduction includes all four elements, meets outside sources requirement. Research question may not be well-motivated, or contributions are vague, limited, or not well connected to economics of discrimination	Up to 1 introduction element missing, or insufficient sources included. Limited connection across elements.	More than two elements missing, or introduction does not motivate question or use appropriate outside sources.
Literature Review	6	Important literature discussed and linked to topic, following key elements above. At least eight peer-review articles discussed, including two top-200 economics papers	Important literature discussed, and key elements addressed. Synthesis is weak and/or literature not linked to paper explicitly. Some articles may not be directly relevant. At least eight peer-review articles discussed, including two top-200 economics papers	Insufficient information to understand how paper fits into literature, because of inadequate synthesis, poor article choice, or misunderstanding of articles. Up to 1–2 missing articles.	More than 2 articles short of requirement and/or literature review does not include the key items above.
Data collection	6	Includes all key elements thoughtfully discussed, with timeline and treatment distribution table	All key elements included, but some key details missing. Or up to 1 element missing	2 elements missing or many key details missing	3 or more elements missing

Results	12	Includes all key elements thoughtfully discussed, with two figures/tables. Hypothesis test(s) conducted correctly. Evidence selected answers research question. Demonstrates critical thinking in interpretation and discussion of results	All key elements included, but some key details missing. Or, results presented but with limited or occasionally inaccurate interpretation	2 elements missing, many key details missing, or largely inaccurate interpretation of results	3 or more elements missing
Data presentation	6	Two or more figures or tables, at least one bar graph with CI or slope chart, that meet all three criteria above	Two or more figures or tables, at least one bar graph with CI or slope chart, that are well chosen but may be difficult to read and interpret or may be cluttered or not well formatted	Two or more figures or tables, but not well selected and/or no bar graph/slope chart, or figures/tables are misleading	Fewer than two figures, or irrelevant figures and tables included or very difficult to interpret
Conclusion	6	Includes all four key elements thoughtfully discussed. Summary hits on key points of paper, and potential policy implications are thought through carefully without speculation.	All four elements included, but some key elements missing or vague, such as policy implications that are far beyond what your research suggests, or a vague/incomplete summary of key findings	1–2 key elements missing or very incomplete	3 or more elements missing or very incomplete
References	6	All sources cited, following Chicago or APA style, free of typos or formatting inconsistencies	All sources cited, following Chicago or APA style, some typos and/or formatting inconsistencies	All sources cited without use of standard style	All sources cited without use of standard style and without sufficient information to identify sources, and/or multiple sources missing
Appendix	6	Sample submissions/scripts complete and included	Sample submissions/scripts included, but some minor elements missing	Sample submissions/scripts included, but some major elements missing	Sample submissions/scripts included, but most major elements missing

Writing style	8	Writing is clear and concise, avoiding wordy or run-on sentences. Tone is professional and neutral. Avoid use of passive voice.	Tone is professional and neutral but writing can be wordy or use a lot of passive voice	Tone is sometimes inappropriate to context, or writing style occasionally impedes understanding	Tone is unprofessional and/or writing style makes it difficult to understand key points
Grammar	4	Few grammatical and typographical errors	Some grammatical and typographical errors, but do not impede understanding	Moderate grammatical errors/typos	Frequent errors impede understanding
Formatting	4	Meets all formatting requirements	Minor deviation from formatting requirements	Exceeds page limit/major deviation from formatting requirements	Formatting requirements completely disregarded
STUDY EXECUTION (24 POINTS)					
Experiment well executed	24	Team shows creativity and initiative in implementing the research project, both identifying and responding effectively to challenges as they arise	Team is able to implement the research project close to how it was designed with some successful adjustments, with success responding to most challenges	Team carries out most of the intended research project, but struggles to identify potential challenges or to develop effective solutions	Team is unable to carry out intended research aims or respond to challenges as they arise
PAPER PREP (8 POINTS)					
Rough draft	4	Rough draft submitted with written content in all sections (outline not sufficient). At least 1500w long, with at least 2 tables/figures	Rough draft submitted with written content in all but one section or up to one table/figure missing. At least 1500w long	Rough draft submitted with written content missing from 2+ sections. At least 1000w long	Rough draft submitted with written content in all but two sections. Less than 1000w long
Peer review	4	Thoughtful peer review completed that answers questions with reasonable effort and provides constructive suggestions, submitted timely	Thoughtful peer review completed that answers questions with reasonable effort, but lacking constructive suggestions	Thoughtful peer review submitted 1–2 days late, or completed timely but with limited reflection and suggestions	Thoughtful peer review submitted 3+ days late, or completed earlier but extremely limited in review
PERSONAL CONTRIBUTIONS (18 POINTS)					

Personal reflection	6	Personal reflection meets criteria and shows thoughtful, critical thinking about own project involvement and learnings	Personal reflection meets stated criteria with some reflection on own project involvement and learning	Either some criteria not met or limited/no reflection on own contributions and learnings	Multiple criteria not met
Individual contribution	12	Group member made high-quality, timely contributions, communicated well with others, took on leading and supporting roles as appropriate	Group member often generally high-quality, timely contributions but not consistently, and/or challenges arose with communication and providing proper leadership/support	Group member contributions were often low quality or not timely, or serious challenges with communication or providing proper leadership/support arose	Group member contributions were insufficient, very late, or required additional team effort to adapt them; participation may have created barriers to successful team progress