Grading rubric for EOS 315 research paper. (30/100 project points possible)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Abstract | Presents overall scope, methods, data, and conclusions in clear capsulated form. Includes specific details, yet is brief (250 word max) and objective. Does not include references or figures.(4) | Summarizes information from paper. May lack some details or not conform to some requirements. (2) | Is vague and does not summarize the whole project. May be too long, or not fit other requirements. (0) |
| Introduction | Engages reader from the beginning. Describes hypothesis, problem or question to be addressed. Explains significance of contribution. Well supported with information from peer-reviewed literature. Establishes focus for paper. (3) | Provides background into topic and some direction as to organization of paper. Adequately describes hypothesis, problem or question to be addressed. (2) | Introduction is confusing and does not engage or orient the reader as to the research focus of the paper. (0) |
| Organization | Paper is carefully and logically organized. The organization tells a story of the research with introduction, methods, results, and conclusions. Data and interpretations are well differentiated. Paragraphs are well defined and transitions flow smoothly. (4) | Most ideas are ordered logically. Transitions are mostly smooth (2) | Paper lacks organization and flow. Data and interpretation are not differentiated. (0) |
| Figures | Figures are well selected to substantiate the main points. Figures are well labeled. Captions are precise and adequately explain figures. (4) | Some figures may be lacking or are not used to support interpretations. Some figures may be inadequately labeled or captioned. (2) |  Figures are absent, irrelevant, or note adequately labeled and captioned. (0) |
| Data |  Data are relevant, well-presented (figures and tables as appropriate) and well explained through text. Data extraneous to the discussion is not included. Data were thoughtfully collected using rigorous methods. Interpretations are distinct from data. (4) |  |  Data is rudimentary and not well presented. Data presented may not be relevant to discussion. (0) |
| Interpretations | Strong original interpretations follow logically from data. (4) |  Substantial interpretations generally follow from data. (2) | Interpretations are insubstantial or do not follow from data.(0) |
| Conclusions | Conclusions containing original thinking, depth and insight. They are justifiable and follow from presented data. They may address additional implications or recommendations for further research. (3) | Significant onclusions follow from data and present logical explanation for data. (2) | Conclusions are insignificant or do not adequately explain data.  |
| References | Sufficient references documented parenthetically in text and in well formatted reference section that follows GSA style guidelines. (2) |  | Inadequate references that are not well documented or do not follow style guidelines. (0) |
| Formatting, Style and Grammar | Contains no errors in grammar or spelling. Format suggests high level of professionalism. Easy pleasurable read. (2) | Few grammatical, spelling, or punctuation errors, but they are not a major distraction. (1) |  Errors make it difficult to follow and obscure meaning. Overall impression of haste – not a revised piece of writing. (0)  |