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" for your title). 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, regardless of the quality. In addition, all sources must be cited correctly. As a reminder, the style you use for citations is up to you, **however** it must be consistent.

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

Introduction

- **Failed/Incomplete (0-5):** The introduction is missing or provides very little context for the research question. The problem statement is unclear or absent.
- **Below Average (6-15):** Intro lacks sufficient background or has a poorly defined problem statement. The research question is unjustified.
- **Good (16-18):** The intro provides a clear overview of the research question with adequate background on the subject.
- **Exemplary (19-20):** In addition to being very well written, the intro explains why the evaluation of the policy is worthwhile to understand, both for regular people as well as policymakers.

Data

- **Failed/Incomplete (0-5):** Data is missing or poorly explained.
- **Below Average (6-15):** The outcome is mentioned, as are the units of analysis (e.g., geography and time). Some mathematical notation is used, mostly incorrectly.
- **Good (16-18):** In addition, the source of the data is cited. The measurement of the outcome is discussed. Besides, the treated unit is stated along with the control group (you can simply cite the paper if your paper uses data from a published source). Furthermore, mostly correct mathematical notations are used.

- **Exemplary (19-20):** In addition to excellent writing, correct and consistent mathematical notation is employed, and is professionally presented.

Methods

- **Failed/Incomplete (0-5):** Missing, or methods are inappropriate for the research question, or inadequacies of a subpar design (i.e., t-test) are not explained. Overall, the section demonstrates little understanding of the method, be it a t-test or OLS.
- **Below Average (6-15):** Methods are mentioned but not justified. Some understanding of the method is shown. Some mathematical notation accompanies the setup, but is mostly incorrect.
- **Good (16-18):** Methods are explained clearly, and the assumptions of the method are mentioned. Demonstrates a good understanding of the method, sa well as its connection to the switching equation. In addition, most math notation is correct. The causal estimand (ATT) is explained and written, showing good understanding of why we are using statistics to impute this effect size of interest.
- **Exemplary (19-20):** In addition to the previous point, methods are written eloquently with clear, correct, and consistent mathematical notation which is correct. All basic assumptions of the method are articulated and explained very well, showing a thorough understanding of the application of regression.

Results

This section assesses how well the results are presented and analyzed:

- **Failed/Incomplete (0-5):** Missing, or an inappropriate discussion of results, including output copied and pasted directly from the software, or any plots/tables submitted as screenshots.
- **Below Average (6-15):** Results are presented but lack appropriate analysis.
- **Good (16-18):** Results are presented well with appropriate discussion depth.
- **Exemplary (19-20):** Results are presented beautifully, with graphs and tables numbered and presented attractively. The uncertainty around the estimate is discussed in detail, as well as the validity of the identifying assumptions.

Discussion and Conclusion

This section evaluates the discussion and conclusion of the report:

- **Failed/Incomplete (0-5):** No discussion, or the discussion fails to explore why the findings matter and simply repeats the results using different language.
- **Below Average (6-15):** The discussion explains some implications of the results.
- **Good (16-18):** The discussion summarizes the findings well.

- **Exemplary (19-20):** In addition to the previous points, the relevance of the results is discussed, explaining why policymakers and the public should care.