Research Paper Rubric

Category	Poor (0 - 18)	Minimally acceptable (19 - 21)	Satisfactory (22-24)	Very Good (25-27)	Excellent (28-30)
Literature Review	Less than 7 relevant sources; some summary, no synthesis; very weak or no argument to support hypotheses or research question	7-10 relevant sources; literature is summarized; some argument is presented to support the hypothesis or research question	7-10 relevant and credible journal/book chapter sources; literature is more summary than synthesis; somewhat clear argument is presented that supports the hypothesis or research question	7-10 relevant and credible journal/book chapter sources; literature is mostly synthesized (not summarized); fairly clear argument is presented that supports the hypothesis or research question	7-10 relevant and credible journal/book chapter sources; literature is synthesized (not summarized); clear argument is presented that supports the hypothesis or research question
Method	Missing or not measuring the variables in H/RQ	Method clearly measures variables in H/RQ; misses some major potential sources of bias (i.e., sampling, timing, leading questions etc.); not an appropriate sample	Method clearly measures variables in H/RQ; pays attention to some potential sources of bias (i.e., sampling, timing, leading questions etc.); mostly appropriate sample	Method clearly measures variables in H/RQ; pays attention to most potential sources of bias (i.e., sampling, timing, leading questions etc.); appropriate sample	Method clearly measures variables in H/RQ; pays attention to potential sources of bias (i.e., sampling, timing, leading questions etc.); appropriate sample
Discussion (including limitations and implications	Discussion section is missing, overstates the inferences, missing limitations and/or implications	Discussion somewhat draws conclusions from results; weak/no ties of results back to literature; weak or no delineation of limitations; weak or no or implications for future research	Clear discussion that draws conclusions from results; weak ties results back to literature; some delineation of limitations; weak or no or implications for future research	Clear discussion that draws conclusions from results without overstating the findings; somewhat ties results back to literature; some delineation of limitations; one or two implications for future research	Clear discussion that draws conclusions from results without overstating the findings; ties results back to literature; clear delineation of limitations; one or two implications for future research
	Poor (0 - 13)	**Minimally acceptable (14)**	**Satisfactory (15)**	**Very Good (16-17)**	**Excellent (18-20)**
Introduction and Conclusion	Missing introduction or conclusion	Introduction: opens the paper Conclusion: Concludes the study rather than the paper	Introduction: States the problem Conclusion: Concludes the paper (not the study) ties back to the introduction	Introduction: States the problem, offers reader a reason why this is an important area to research Conclusion: Concludes the paper (not the study) ties back to the introduction	Introduction: States the problem clearly, offers reader a reason why this is an important area to research Conclusion: Concludes the paper (not the study) ties back to the introduction

Results	Missing results; wrong or confusing analysis performed; confusing statement of results	Tests the variables and relationships indicated in the H/RQ; understandable analysis used; confusing statement of results	Appropriately tests the variables and relationships indicated in the H/RQ; understandable analysis used; mostly clearly stated	Clearly and appropriately tests the variables and relationships indicated in the H/RQ; understandable analysis used; mostly clearly stated	Clearly and appropriately tests the variables and relationships indicated in the H/RQ; appropriate analysis used; clearly stated
Peer Reviews	Materials were incomplete or missing at one or more stage of peer review; missed one or more sharing of comments with peers	Materials were not complete at each stage of peer review; comments to peers were not very helpful	Materials were mostly complete at each stage of peer review; offered some comments to peers	Materials were complete at each stage of peer review; offered helpful comments to peers	Materials were complete at each stage of peer review; offered thoughtful and considered suggestions to peers
Writing and Organization	Not well organized; weak transitions; argument confusing to follow: serious disconnects between H/RQ and other sections of the paper	Somewhat well-organized or good transitions (not both); argument somewhat confused; some disconnects between H/RQ and other sections of the paper	Somewhat well-organized with good transitions; argument mostly clear; lit review somewhat supports H/RQ. Method tests H/RQ. Results and discussion explain H/RQ.	Mostly well-organized with good transitions; argument easily followed: lit review supports H/RQ. Method tests H/RQ. Results and discussion explain H/RQ.	Very well organized with solid transitions; argument easily followed; lit review supports H/RQ. Method tests H/RQ. Results and discussion explain H/RQ.
Editing and Formatting	Many errors in APA formatting; not 12-15 pages; missing cover page, abstract or references; many grammatical errors or typos; not double-spaced, 1 inch margins and/or 12-point font	Mostly correct use of APA in formatting paper and references; 12-15 pp. not counting cover page, abstract and references; double-spaced, 1 inch margins, 12-point font, lots of grammatical errors or typos that interfere with understanding	Mostly correct use of APA in formatting paper and references; 12-15 pp. not counting cover page, abstract and references; double-spaced, 1 inch margins, 12-point font, quite a few grammatical errors or typos	Correct use of APA in formatting paper and references; 12-15 pp. not counting cover page, abstract and references; double-spaced, 1 inch margins, 12-point font, some grammatical errors or typos	Correct use of APA in formatting paper and references; 12-15 pp. not counting cover page, abstract and references; double-spaced, 1 inch margins, 12-point font, very few grammatical errors or typos
	Poor (6)	**Minimally acceptable (7)**	**Satisfactory (8)**	**Very Good (9)**	**Excellent (10)**
Hypothesis or Research Question	Missing hypothesis or research question -	Acceptably stated H/RQ: not a declarative sentence or simple question; not clear what tests will be needed; variables are unclear and/or not clearly measurable	Acceptably stated H/RQ: declarative sentence or simple question; not clear what tests will be needed; variables are unclear and/or not clearly measurable	Somewhat clearly stated H/RQ: declarative sentence or simple question; not clear if it requires one test to support or not support; variables are clear and but not clearly measurable	Clearly stated H/RQ: declarative sentence or simple question; requires one test to support or not support; variables are clear and measurable