

	Outstanding	Good	Below Average	Poor
Literature review and theory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a variety of peer reviewed sources. No over-reliance on a single citation to build research design • Sources are used not to summarize what others are doing, but rather to craft an argument • Organized into sections • Articulates at least 2 hypotheses • Clear connection between hypotheses and lit review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses variety of sources but somewhat reliant on just a few sources • Sources sometimes used to craft an argument, but also lots of summary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overly reliant on a single/few sources and/or the sources are not academic • Reads more like a summary of the field than a narrative to build a theory • Not split into sections- reads like long single paragraph • Hard to connect the hypotheses to lit review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little/no citation and sources not academic. • Not split into sections • No hypotheses stated, or missing components • Unclear connection between text and topic
Research Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data identified, including proper citation and discussion of it's temporal/geographic coverage • Proper identification of the population of interest • Identification of key independent and dependent variables, including how they are measured • Identification of unit of analysis • Full discussion of plan of analysis. • Research design fully connects to hypotheses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data identified, but less clear what the target population is and the coverage • Incomplete discussion of how key variables are measured • Little/No discussion of control variables being used. • Research design vague • Hard to connect research design to hypotheses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing components of the research design • Vague discussion of key measures and sources • Very vague discussion of plan for analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No justification for the data being included • No citations for data • Incorrect identification of pieces of research design.
References	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All cited sources present • No references not cited in the body present • In appropriate format • References all highly relevant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All cited sources present • In appropriate format • References relevant and appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most cited sources present • Generally in appropriate format References relevant and appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many sources absent • Inappropriate format References not most relevant/appropriate to study
Grammar and mechanics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraphs well organized • Sections with logical organization of paragraphs (especially introduction, results and conclusions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most paragraphs well organized • Sections with logical organization of paragraphs (especially introduction, results and conclusions) • Several grammatical errors, typos, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many paragraphs well organized • Several grammatical errors, typos, and misspelling may be present 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paper lacks well organized paragraphs • Sections do not contain information presented in a logical order • Many grammatical errors

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few grammatical errors, typos and misspellings • Appropriate word selection • Correct use of scientific terms • 	misspelling may be present <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some inappropriate word usage errors (effect vs. affect) Some misuse of scientific terms		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many inappropriate word usage errors (e.g., effect vs. affect) • Many misuses of scientific terms •
Overall Evaluation	55-60points	• 50-54 points	• 44-50 points	0-43 points