

	Criteria	Accept (4)	Accept with minor edits (3)	Resubmit with revision (2)	Reject (1)	Score (52)
	Title	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear, concise, and relevant to the paper. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title is complete but requires further specificity in vocabulary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title present, but too vague: missing chunks of what was done. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title is absent. 	
	Abstract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 150-250 words. • Clearly communicates the purpose of research and summarizes the argument and the findings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract is not concise (or is too long) and the nature of the argument may not be clearly or explicitly outlined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract is too long and/or lacking multiple key components (what was done, how, and the outcome). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract is off topic and is missing key components. Places too much emphasis on a certain component. 	
	Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Connections drawn are mostly accurate and logical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	

	<p>Questions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem addressed by the paper is clearly defined and the significance of the project is convincingly explained. • Research question explicitly stated and clear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not address a clear problem. • Does not engage a scholarly debate. 	
	<p>Objectives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives of the research project are stated and are clear from the beginning and throughout the introduction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives of the research project are stated and are somewhat clear from the beginning and throughout the introduction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives of the research project are somewhat implied and not explicitly stated. • Objectives may not be clear from the beginning and throughout the introduction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives of the research project are not included or stated. • Objective of research is unclear from the beginning and throughout the introduction. 	
	<p>Terms defined</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key terms introduced in the paper are clear and accurately defined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key terms are defined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key terms are vaguely or incorrectly defined. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key terms are not defined. 	
	<p>Methods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Argument is not clear and does not precisely state the premises, inference, and argument structures. • Internal consistency of the argument is not present. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Argument is severely lacking and does not precisely state premises, inference, and argument structures. • No internal consistency evident. 	

	Findings/ Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No meaningful conclusion in evidence. • Maybe 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No spelling and grammar mistakes. Appropriate word choice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal spelling and grammar mistakes. Occasional awkward word choice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noticeable spelling and grammar mistakes. Word choice occasionally informal in tone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many spelling/ grammar mistakes. Informal word choice. 	

	Organization & Logic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, writing has great flow and is easy to follow. • Writing shows high degree of attention to logic and reasoning of points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing has some gaps in overall flow and/or illogical structure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing has a few awkward or unclear passages. Organization is largely illogical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing is choppy, and hard to follow. Organization and/or argument is illogical and hard to understand. 	
	Citations & References	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cites most data obtained from other sources. • APA citation style is used in both text and references page. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cites some data obtained from other sources. • Citation style is either inconsistent or incorrect. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plagiarized from outside sources. 	
	Total score					