|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Outstanding** | **Good** | **Below Average** | **Poor** |
| **Literature review and theory** | * 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. | * Uses variety of sources but somewhat reliant on just a few sources * Sources sometimes used to craft an argument, but also lots of summary | * 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 | * 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** | * 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 | * 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 | * Missing components of the research design * Vague discussion of key measures and sources * Very vague discussion of plan for analysis. | * No justification for the data being included * No citations for data * Incorrect identification of pieces of research design. |
| **References** | * All cited sources present * No references not cited in the body present * In appropriate format * References all highly relevant | * All cited sources present * In appropriate format * References relevant and appropriate | * Most cited sources present * Generally in appropriate format   References relevant and appropriate | * Many sources absent * Inappropriate format   References not most relevant/appropriate to study |
| **Grammar and mechanics** | * Paragraphs well organized * Sections with logical organization of paragraphs (especially introduction, results and conclusions) * Few grammatical errors, typos and misspellings * Appropriate word selection * Correct use of scientific terms | * Most paragraphs well organized * Sections with logical organization of paragraphs (especially introduction, results and conclusions) * Several grammatical errors, typos, and misspelling may be present * Some misappropriate word usage errors (effect vs. affect)   Some misuse of scientific terms | * Many paragraphs well organized * Several grammatical errors, typos, and misspelling may be present | * Paper lacks well organized paragraphs * Sections do not contain information presented in a logical order * Many grammatical errors * Many misappropriate word useage errors (e.g., effect vs. affect) * Many misuses of scientific terms |
| **Overall Evaluation** | **55-60points** | * **50-54 points** | * **44-50 points** | **0-43 points** |