**Total points possible: 80 points**

**Title page and manuscript organization.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum Project Content** | **Complete (all points)** | **Pts** |
| **Title page** | The title of the project is listed, and each group members full name is included. | 1 |
| **Content** | Submission contains title page, introduction, methods, results, discussion, conclusion, literature cited. | 2 |
| **Submission** | One copy of the manuscript is submitted per group, and the manuscript is titled the last name of all group members\_env226finalpaper. (example: SpearsCollinsRothchild\_env226finalpaper.pdf) Submitted as a PDF. | 2 |
| ***Total*** |  | /5 |

**Introduction: The introduction provides a broad overview of your topic, its importance, and ends with your research question, which leads into the rest of the paper.**

**Group Project Evaluation Rubric – INTRODUCTION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum Project Content** | **Complete (all points)** | **Somewhat Complete**  **(2/3 of points)** | **Somewhat**  **Incomplete (1/3 of points)** | **Incomplete (0 pts)** | **Pts** |
| ***Overview of issue and its broadest relevance***  ***(3 points)*** | Broad importance of the issue is described completely and in a way that a reader can understand. Uses standard and correct English grammar and spelling and correct and understandable sentence construction. | Broad importance of the issue is described, but lacks key details. Some grammatical and spelling errors OR a message that is difficult to follow. | Description of the broad importance of the issue is unclear, hard to follow, or lacks logical flow. Some grammatical and spelling errors AND a message that is difficult to follow. | Does not provide a broad description of the broad importance of the issue. Lots of grammatical and spelling errors and a message that is difficult to follow. |  |
| ***Overview of what we already know relevant to the topic (references to previous work)***  ***(4 points)*** | Clear description of the state of relevant knowledge supported by references. Uses standard and correct English grammar and spelling and correct and understandable sentence construction. | Clear, but unsupported, description of the state of relevant knowledge. Some grammatical and spelling errors OR a message that is difficult to follow. | Unclear and unsupported description of the state of relevant knowledge. Some grammatical and spelling errors AND a message that is difficult to follow. | No description of the state of relevant knowledge. Lots of grammatical and spelling errors and a message that is difficult to follow. |  |
| ***Transition to remainder of the paper (how your methods will contribute to our knowledge of the topic)***  ***(1 points)*** | Clear explanation of the project and how it helps to advance our understanding (ends with your question or objective). | Incomplete explanation of the project and how it helps to advance our understanding (ends with your question or objective). | Unclear and incomplete explanation of the project and how it helps to advance our understanding (ends with your question or objective). | No transition explaining the project and how it helps to advance our understanding |  |
| ***References cited (bibliography)***  ***(2 points!!)*** | Cites 5 or more peer-reviewed references in text (author, date) and uses correct format in bibliography | Cites insufficient number of references, lacks in-text citations, OR uses incorrect citation format | Cites insufficient number of references, lacks in-text citations, AND/OR uses incorrect citation format | Does not cite references |  |
| ***Total*** |  |  |  |  | /10 |

**Methods for a literature are short and straight forward, providing information on the database that you searched, the time period that you used, specific search terms, methods of excluding papers, and how you interpreted themes in your literature. Your methods should allow a researcher to replicate what you did.**

**Group Project Evaluation Rubric – METHODS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum Project Content** | **Complete (all points)** | **Somewhat Complete**  **(2/3 of points)** | **Somewhat**  **Incomplete (1/3 of points)** | **Incomplete (0 pts)** | **Pts** |
| ***Clear relationship between methods and the overall question/project (that is, methods are appropriate for the goal).***  ***(1 point)*** | Relationship between methods and question is described completely and in a way that a reader can understand. A clear statement of the objectives of this work that is linked to the introduction. | Relationship is described, but lacks key details | Relationship is unclear, hard to follow, or lacks logical flow | Does not indicate relationship between methods and overall question |  |
| ***Complete description of methods, including how data was collected and analyzed.***  ***(9 points)*** | Clear and detailed description of the methodology. The what, when, why, where and how of the research are described completely, including: Search methods (Boolean operators, asterisks, and quotes, if used), database used, time period over which the search was conducted, criteria for inclusion and exclusion of papers and broad methods for describing themes. | Somewhat clear description of planned methodology, missing key details. | Unclear description of planned methodology. | No description of planned methodology. |  |
| ***Table showing coded citation list (10 pts.)*** | Table with complete citation list (20 or more citations), with a column describing the theme of the paper (i.e., code for the content). Can be included as an Appendix, if desired. | Table with 10 - 15 citation list, with a column describing the theme of the paper (i.e., code for the content) | Table with fewer than 10 citations, with a column describing the theme of the paper (i.e., code for the content) | No table |  |
| ***Total*** |  |  |  |  | /20 |

**Results are simple for literature reviews. State how many papers your review returned, how many were excluded, how publication rates changed through time, and how many themes emerged from your readings.**

**Group Project Evaluation Rubric – RESULTS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum Project Content** | **Complete (all points)** | **Somewhat Complete**  **(2/3 of points)** | **Somewhat**  **Incomplete (1/3 of points)** | **Incomplete (0 pts)** | **Pts** |
| ***Results: explanation in text of what you found. No interpretation (save that for Discussion).***  ***(5 points)*** | Results are described completely and in a way that a reader can understand. This includes how many papers were returned in the search, how many were excluded, and the final number of papers included in the review. Describe some aspect of the nature of the results, which is linked to your figure. | Results are described, but lack key details. | Results are unclear, hard to follow, or lack logical flow. | Results are not described in text. |  |
| ***Results: at least one figure illustrating some characteristic of the body of literature that you reviewed (10 points)*** | At least one figure student-generated figure describing the literature reviewed included, along with clear legends explaining their contents. Figure contains axis labels and an appropriate figure legend. | Somewhat clear figure, missing some key details. | Very unclear figure, missing key details. | No table or figure. |  |
| ***Total*** |  |  |  |  | /15 |

**The discussion is the heart of the review. This is where you describe themes related to your literature search and in a well-cited and cogent manner.**

**Group Project Evaluation Rubric –DISCUSSION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minimum Project Content** | **Complete (all points)** | **Somewhat Complete**  **(2/3 of points)** | **Somewhat**  **Incomplete (1/3 of points)** | **Incomplete (0 pts)** | **Pts** |
| ***Discussion: Interpretation of the key findings and why they are important. (15 points)*** | Three to Four themes related to your topic discussed. Findings are interpreted thoughtfully and in a way that a reader can understand. Content is appropriately cited. Uses standard and correct English grammar and spelling and correct and understandable sentence construction. | Two themes related to topic discussed. Interpretation is sparse or hurried. Some grammatical and spelling errors OR a message that is difficult to follow. | Two themes discussed. Interpretation is unclear, hard to follow, or lacks logical flow. Some grammatical and spelling errors AND a message that is difficult to follow. | One theme discussed. There is no interpretation of findings. Lots of grammatical and spelling errors and a message that is difficult to follow. |  |
| ***Conclusion: Explanation of the key findings of the study. What’s the main take-home message? (5 points)*** | Key findings are described in the discussion, providing a clear main take-home message for the reader. | Key findings are incomplete, lacking key details. | Key findings are unclear, hard to follow, or lack logical flow. | No key findings are described. |  |
| ***Literature cited (10 points)*** | Cites 20 or more peer-reviewed references in text (author, date) and uses correct format in bibliography. | Cites insufficient number of references, lacks in-text citations, OR uses incorrect citation format. | Cites insufficient number of references, lacks in-text citations, AND/OR uses incorrect citation format. | Does not cite references. |  |
| ***Total*** |  |  |  |  | /30 |