# Recommendation Report Rubric - Criteria 6 to 14

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Almost Meets Expectations | Needs Work to Meet Expectations | Missing or Incomplete |
| Methods | Methods are described with exceptional clarity and detail, fully explaining primary and secondary research approaches. Another researcher could easily replicate the study without confusion. | Methods section clearly and completely describes primary and secondary research, with enough detail for readers to understand and duplicate the work. | Methods section generally describes research activities but lacks full clarity, omits minor steps, or under-explains primary or secondary research. | Methods are poorly explained, missing major steps or clarity. Primary and secondary research may be unclear, confused, or incomplete. | No methods section submitted, or the section lacks meaningful description of the research conducted. |
| Results | Results are presented with outstanding clarity, organization, and objectivity, using strong visuals or headings where appropriate. No interpretation intrudes on the reporting. | Results are clearly organized and presented objectively, with no interpretation mixed in. Findings are complete and logically arranged. | Results section reports major findings but may be partially disorganized, omit some minor data, or briefly lapse into interpretation. | Results are incomplete, unclear, or confused with interpretation; key findings are missing or not presented objectively. | No results section submitted, or major findings are not reported. |
| Conclusions | Conclusions are insightful, strongly tied to results, and show sophisticated understanding of the implications. Logical, clear, and persuasive. | Conclusions clearly explain the meaning and implications of the results, with strong, direct ties to the findings. | Conclusions are somewhat connected to the findings but may be too general, unclear, or partially unsupported. | Conclusions are weak, unsupported, or disconnected from the results; implications are vague or absent. | No conclusions section submitted, or conclusions do not relate to results. |
| Recommendations | Recommendations are highly practical, specific, well-supported by conclusions, and show strong evaluation of available options. | Recommendations are clear, specific, actionable, and directly based on conclusions, with evaluation of possible actions. | Recommendations are partially clear or specific, or only loosely tied to conclusions; evaluation of options may be superficial. | Recommendations are vague, impractical, unsupported, or disconnected from the conclusions; limited evaluation of options. | No recommendations section submitted, or recommendations are missing or unusable. |
| Actionable Advice | Actionable advice is highly specific, clearly prioritized, and provides strong practical steps based on conclusions. | Advice is specific, actionable, and clearly based on the conclusions drawn. | Advice is present but may be somewhat vague, generic, or only loosely based on conclusions. | Advice is unclear, impractical, or disconnected from the report’s conclusions. | No actionable advice provided or advice does not align with conclusions. |
| References/Documentation | All sources are cited impeccably both in-text and in the bibliography, following a consistent professional format with zero errors. | All sources are correctly cited in-text and in the bibliography using a consistent citation format. | Citations are generally present but may contain minor errors or occasional inconsistencies in format. | Citations are inconsistent, improperly formatted, incomplete, or unclear. | No references submitted, or citations are largely absent or incorrect. |
| Appendices | Appendices are highly organized, clearly labeled, well-titled, and strongly support the main report content. Formatting is flawless. | Appendices are labeled and titled correctly, organized logically, and directly support the report content. | Appendices are included but may have minor labeling, organization, or formatting errors. Some materials may be unclear. | Appendices are poorly organized, improperly labeled, missing titles, or provide limited support to the report. | No appendices submitted, or appendices are largely incomplete or missing required features. |
| Professional Design and Formatting | Document is exceptionally polished, with professional layout, clear headings, excellent visual integration, and outstanding ease of navigation. | Document is professionally formatted with clear headings, visuals, and logical organization that supports reader navigation. | Document shows some professional formatting but may have inconsistencies in headings, visual integration, or organization. | Document is disorganized, lacks clear headings or visuals, or is difficult to navigate. | Document lacks professional formatting; no attention to layout, headings, or visuals. |
| Originality | Work is completely original, thoughtfully developed, and all sources are perfectly cited and integrated. | Work is original, and all borrowed material is properly cited. | Minor originality or citation issues are present but overall intent to credit sources is clear. | Major issues with originality or citation; work may improperly use or fail to credit sources. | Work is plagiarized or largely copied without proper attribution. |