

Paper Rubric

Jared Greathouse

Here is the rubric for the policy data report. The first draft of the paper is due on October 28th, 2024. The papers must, at minimum, have your name, date, and title of the paper (make it interesting, *please* do not simply write “The effect of policy x on y”). I repeat once more, I will deduct as many points from each section that I think was written by AI. If I have reason to believe that half the discussion and conclusion, for example, was written by AI, the maximum grade you may make for this section is a 10, in addition to whatever the quality is. In addition, all sources must be cited correctly.

The paper is due by email. **Papers without accompanying do files (or R script, or Python script) will not be accepted.** Additionally, the script you send must actually replicate your findings (I will run them to check).

Section	Failed/Incomplete (0-5)	Below Average (6-15)	Good (16-18)	Exemplary (19-20)
Introduction	Missing or provides very little context for the research question. The problem statement is unclear or absent.	Lacks sufficient background or has a poorly defined problem statement. Research question is not well-motivated.	Provides a clear overview of the research question with adequate background.	In addition to the previous point, explains why the evaluation of the policy is worthwhile to understand.
Data	Missing/or data is poorly explained.	Data are explained decently.	In addition, the source of the data is cited. The outcome is measured and justified. In addition, the treated unit is stated along with the control group, as well as justifications for any modifications to control groups. In addition, some math notation is used.	In addition to excellent writing, correct mathematical notation is employed.
Methods	Missing, or: methods are inappropriate for the research question or the inadequacies of a subpar design (i.e., t-test) are not explained.	Methods are decently explained, but not justified (vice versa).	Methods are explained clearly and the assumptions of the method are mentioned. Some mathematical notation accompanies the setup.	In addition to the previous point, methods are written well with correct mathematical notation. The causal estimand is explained, and all basic assumptions of the method are articulated very well.
Results	No discussion of results, or an inappropriate discussion of results. This includes output that is copied and pasted directly from the software.	Results are presented decently, but lack appropriate analysis (vice versa).	Results are presented well and have appropriate depth.	Results are presented beautifully. In particular, graphs and tables are numbered, in order, and presented in an attractive manner. In addition to the effect of the policy, the uncertainty around the estimate are discussed in detail, as well as the validity of the identifying assumptions.
Discussion and Conclusion	No discussion, or: discussion fails to explore why the findings matter, or the simply repeats the results using different language.	Discussion explains some implications of results.	Discussion summarizes the findings well.	In addition to the previous points, the relevance of the results are discussed and why policymakers/the public should care.