Aresty Rutgers Undergraduate Research Journal Humanities Submission Rubric

	Criteria	Accept (4)	Accept with minor edits (3)	Resubmit with revision (2)	Reject (1)	Score (52)
	Title	• Clear, concise, and relevant to the paper.	• Title is complete but requires further specificity in vocabulary.	• Title present, but too vague: missing chunks of what was done.	• Title is absent.	
	Abstract	• 150-250 words. • Clearly communicates the purpose of research and summarizes the argument and the findings.	• Abstract is not concise (or is too long) and the nature of the argument may not be clearly or explicitly outlined.	• Abstract is too long and/or lacking multiple key components (what was done, how, and the outcome).	• Abstract is off topic and is missing key components. Places too much emphasis on a certain component.	
	Introduction	• Introduction is well developed comprehensive, and organized. Relevant literature is cited. • Well focused on the purpose of the assignment. Clearly defines subtopics to be reviewed. • Includes a thesis with a clear precise plan, a "roadmap" for how the author will establish this thesis, and sticks to this organizational structure throughout the paper. • Specific thesis statement included and is easily identifiable and plausible.	• Introduction is largely developed. Material is mostly on assignment's purpose and is organized, but veers off topic at times. • Largely comprehensive, conveys general idea and key subtopics(s) to be reviewed. • Includes a thesis with a somewhat unclear roadmap as how the author will establish the thesis. Author does not necessarily stick to the roadmap throughout the paper. • General thesis statement included.	• Introduction is moderately developed. Material is not organized and is off focus multiple times. • Partly comprehensive, includes general idea, but not all key subtopic(s) to be reviewed. Material is somewhat defined and sufficient. • Thesis included may or may not be clear with a vague roadmap as to how the author will establish the thesis. • General thesis statement included.	• Introduction is poorly developed. Material is disorganized and lacks focus on purpose. Not comprehensive, general idea and subtopics are vague and underdeveloped. • Does not describe subtopics to be reviewed. • Thesis may not be included. No reference to a roadmap or how it the paper will be established and organized. • Lacks adequate thesis statement.	
	General Context	• Clearly shows an understanding of the topic and issues of interest and presents the positions of others. • Integrates their own position in a framework that captures the subject. • Connections drawn are accurate and logical.	• Presents an understanding of the topic and describes the issues of interest. May or may not present the positions of others. • Integrates their own position in a framework that captures most the subject material at hand. • Connects drawn are mostly accurate and logical.	• Shows somewhat an understanding of the topic at hand and presents issues of interest. The position of others may/may not be included. • Integrates some of their position in a framework that captures the subject material at hand. • Connections are somewhat inaccurate.	• Does not show an understanding of the topic at hand and/or present the issues of interest. The position of others is not included. • Integrates some of their position in the framework ineffectively. • Connections are inaccurate and illogical.	

	Questions	• Problem addressed by the paper is clearly defined and the significance of the project is convincingly explained. • Research question explicitly stated and clear.	• Problem is defined and explained clearly, and the writer competently explains its significance and the related scholarly debate. • Research question is explicitly stated and clear.	• Problem is not clearly defined or fully explained. • The context of the problem - its scope, significance, and the scholarly debate - is not clearly identified or is somewhat vague and undeveloped.	• Does not address a clear problem. • Does not engage a scholarly debate.	
	Objectives	• Objectives of the research project are stated and are clear from the beginning and throughout the introduction.	• Objectives of the research project are stated and are somewhat clear from the beginning and throughout the introduction.	• Objectives of the research project are somewhat implied and not explicitly stated. • Objectives may not be clear from the beginning and throughout the introduction.	• Objectives of the research project are not included or stated. • Objective of research is unclear from the beginning and throughout the introduction.	
	Terms defined	• Key terms introduced in the paper are clear and accurately defined.	• Key terms are defined.	• Key terms are vaguely incorrectly defined.	• Key terms are not defined.	
	Methods	• Argument clearly and precisely states premises, inferences, and argument structures needed to establish the overall thesis of the paper. • Internal consistency of the argument is present.	• Argument somewhat clearly and precisely states the premises, inferences, and argument structures needed to establish/support the thesis. • Internal consistency of the argument is somewhat present.	• Argument is not clear and does not precisely states the premises, inference, and argument structures. • Internal consistency of the argument is not present.	• Argument is severely lacking and does not precisely state premises, inference, and argument structures. • No internal consistency evident.	

	Findings/ Results	• Content indicates synthesis of ideas, in depth analysis and evidences original thought and support for the topic. Clearly and compellingly analyzes the ideas and concepts involved. • Clearly characterizes, explains, and analyzes the positions of others. • Presents a remarkable, creative, and novel thesis that demonstrates keen insight.	• Somewhat clearly articulates the topic at hand. May or may not break down the problem into its constituent parts. • Clearly analyses the ideas and concepts involved. • May not clearly characterize, explain or analyze the positions of others. • Presents a remarkable thesis that demonstrates keen insight.	• Somewhat clearly articulates the topic at hand. Does not break down the problem into its constituent parts for in-depth analysis. • Does not clearly analyze all ideas and concepts involved. • May not clearly characterize, explain, or analyze the positions of others. • May not present a remarkable thesis that demonstrates insight.	• Does not clearly articulate topic at hand. Does not break down the problem into its constituent parts. • Does not clearly analyze ideas and concepts involved. • Does not present remarkable thesis.	
	Conclusion & discussion	• Clear summary of the key points presented in the paper. • Author presents a highly plausible argument and logical conclusion. • Author explicitly articulates the degree to which their argumentative strategy lends support to their overall thesis and conclusion.	• Reiterates the connection of the research and reminds readers of its significance. • May only superficially mention the implications of the project. • Argument presented is logical and plausible.	• Offers a general rather than specific conclusion that is a bit perfunctory. • May not explain the significance of the findings. • Author argument and conclusion is somewhat logical. • Author does not make thoughtful connections between argument and thesis/conclusion.	• No meaningful conclusion in evidence. • May be overly short and "tacked on" to the end, or inconsistent with the body of the paper. • Does not convey a sense of what the paper has achieved. • Does not demonstrate revision between drafts.	
	Sentence-level clarity	• No spelling and grammar mistakes. Appropriate word choice.	• Minimal spelling and grammar mistakes. Occasional awkward word choice.	• Noticeable spelling and grammar mistakes. Word choice occasionally informal in tone.	• Many spelling/ grammar mistakes. Informal word choice.	

	Organization & Logic	• Overall, writing has great flow and is easy to follow. • Writing shows high degree of attention to logic and reasoning of points.	• Writing has some gaps in overall flow and/or illogical structure.	• Writing has a few awkward or unclear passages. Organization is largely illogical.	• Writing is choppy, and hard to follow. Organization and/or argument is illogical and hard to understand.	
	Citations & References	• Cites all data obtained from other sources. • APA citation style is used in both text and references page. • Has the style appropriate for the submission.	• Cites most data obtained from other sources. • APA citation style is used in both text and references page.	• Cites some data obtained from other sources. • Citation style is either inconsistent or incorrect.	• Plagiarized from outside sources.	
	Total score					