|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Max. mark** | **Your mark** | **Grade** | **Exemplary** | **Proficient** | **Competent** |
| Ninc=1 |  |  |  | 90% to 100% | 74% to 89% | 66% to 73% |
| **Abstract** | 20 | 20 | Exemplary  (+) | States clearly question being asked.  Gives any hypothesis being tested.  Highlights most important findings with enough information to understand study.  States major findings and conclusions.  Is a concise summary of question and findings. Approx. 300 words and  key words. | Is missing one component of a good abstract.  Abstract is not well organized or concise. | Is missing two or more components of a good abstract.  Does not give an overview that leads directly to the reader being able to state the major findings of the study. Is not written in a scientific style.  Includes references in abstract. |
| **Introduction**  **Introduce the problem**. The body of a manuscript opens with an introduction that presents the specific problem under study and describes the research strategy.  **Explore importance of the problem**.  **State hypotheses and their correspondence to research design**. | 20 | 20 | Exemplary  (+) | Provides the reader with the necessary information to understand the proposed study.  Piques the readers interest and makes the importance of the question real.  Gives appropriate information to previous studies that have an impact on the current study.  Does not contain superfluous information and/or is not wordy.  Gives a description of the specific purpose of the study, a description of any hypothesis being tested, and a summary of the methodology being used. | Contains some superfluous information.  Does not pique the interest of the reader.  Is missing some needed background information.  Gives too much information--more like a summary.  Has all the components of a good introduction yet some parts may be difficult to understand.  Gives a description of the study methodology with some comment on its appropriate use. | Is missing one or two components of a good introduction.  Contains significant superfluous information.  Gives a description of the study methodology. |
| **Coverage** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Justified criteria for inclusion and exclusion from review.** | 10 | 10 | Exemplary  (+) | Justified inclusion and exclusion of literature. | Discussed the literature included and excluded. | Did not discuss the criteria inclusion or exclusion. |
| **Synthesis** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Distinguished what has been done in the field from what needs to be done.** | 20 | 20 | Exemplary  (+) | Critically distinguishes what has and has not been done. | Discussed what has and has not been done. | Did not distinguish what has and has not been done. |
| **Placed the topic or problem in the broader research literature.** | 20 | 20 | Exemplary  (+) | Topic clearly situated in broader scholarly literature. | Some discussion of broader scholarly literature. | Topic not placed in broader scholarly literature. |
| **Placed the research in the historical context of the field.** | 20 | 20 | Exemplary  (+) | Critically examined history of topic. | Some mention of history of topic. | History of topic not discussed. |
| **Acquired and enhanced the subject vocabulary.** | 20 | 20 | Exemplary  (+) | Discussed and resolved ambiguities in definitions. | Key vocabulary defined. | Key vocabulary not discussed. |
| **Articulated important variables and phenomena relevant to the topic.** | 20 | 20 | Exemplary  (+) | Noted ambiguities in literature and proposed new relationships. | Reviewed relationships among key variables. | Key variables and phenomena not discussed. |
| **Synthesized and gained a new perspective on the literature.** | 20 | 20 | Exemplary  (+) | Offered new perspective. | Some critique of literature. | Accepted literature at face value. |
| **Methodology** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Identified the main methodologies and research techniques that have been used in the field, and their advantages and disadvantages.** | 20 | 20 | Exemplary  (+) | Critiqued research methods. | Some discussion of research methods used to produce claims. | Research methods not discussed. |
| **Related ideas and theories in the field to research methodologies.** | 20 | 20 | Exemplary  (+) | Critiqued appropriateness of research methods to warrant claims. | Some discussion of appropriateness of research methods to warrant claims. | No discussion of appropriateness of research methods to warrant claims. |
| **Significance** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Rationalized the practical significance of the research problem.** | 20 | 20 | Exemplary  (+) | Critiqued practical significance of research. | Practical significance discussed. | Practical significance of research not discussed. |
| **Rationalized the scholarly significance of the research problem.** | 20 | 20 | Exemplary  (+) | Critiqued scholarly significance of research. | Scholarly significance discussed. | Scholarly significance of research not discussed. |
| **Rhetoric** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Written with a coherent, clear structure that supported the review.** | 20 | 20 | Exemplary  (+) | Well developed, coherent. | Some coherent structure. | Poorly conceptualized, haphazard. |
| **Citations/References: Proper APA format** | 20 | 20 | Exemplary  (+) | All needed citations were included in the report.  References matched the citations, and all were in APA format (6th ed.). The paper is double spaced in a 12-point serif font, has 1-inch margins, APA-style headings, and includes well-formed 6th ed. APA reference list for all citations. | Citations within the body of the report and a corresponding reference list were presented. Some formatting problems exist, or components were missing.  The paper lacks some of the following features: double spacing, 12-point serf font, 1-inch margins, APA-style headings, or a nearly complete 6th ed. APA reference list. | Citations for statements included in the report were not present, or references which were included were not found in the text. The Final paper lacks several of the following features: double spacing, 12- point serf font, 1-inch margins, APA- style headings, or a nearly complete 6th ed. APA reference list. |
| Penalties or bonuses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 290 | 290 |  |  |  |  |
| Percentages | 100% | 100% |  |  |  |  |
| Mark for this assignment | 20 | 20 |  |  |  |  |
| Grade for this assignment |  |  | Exemplary (+) |  |  |  |