

**RESEARCH PAPER GRADING RUBRIC**    **AUTHOR'S NAME:** \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>Fails</b>	<b>Meets Basic Requirements</b>	<b>Exceeds Basic Requirements</b>
<b>Research</b>	Sources are weak for example "www.weather.com"  Wikipedia lands you here (0 - 1 pt)	Your source is reasonable for a high school student including for example: <i>National Geographic, Scientific American, Popular Science</i> and similar publications (2 pt)	Your source is exceptional and comes from primary peer-reviewed sources in science  (4 pt)
<b>Summary</b>	The main topic or purpose of your article is unclear  (0 pt)	Your article summary is basic and generally explains the article.  I can understand the topics of your article but not the finer points or the important aspects lack detail. (1 - 2 pt)	Your article summary provides an excellent explanation of the article.  I can clearly and easily understand your articles by reading your summaries.  I can clearly and easily understand the main points covered in your article by reading your summary. (3 - 4 pts)
<b>Reflection</b>	Little or no insight or interest is present (0 - 1 pt)	Your reflections are basic and to the point.  Your reflections show you have thought about your sources but they lack much personal introspection or relevance to your life. (2 pt)	Insight into the topic goes above the individual citations. You clearly thought about the implications shown in your articles and made them personal and/or shown relevance to your life. (3 - 4 pts)
<b>Format</b>	Report is not typed or there are frequent and obvious departures from standard MLA format (0 pt)	Paragraphs are generally too short or much too long.  Most of the paper is in standard MLA format, but there are multiple/significant lapses (1 pt)	Each section is at least 1 paragraph and no more than 2 paragraphs.  Times New Roman, 12 point font, double-spaced --  Standard MLA format (2 pt)
	Frequent errors in spelling and grammar (0 pt)	Spelling and grammar errors are present but do not distract from the paper (1 pt)	Spelling and grammar errors or absent or infrequent. (2 pt)
<b>Reliability</b>	The date of each of your articles is not discussed or is discussed poorly:  For example: "This article was published in November 2010, so it must be credible" (1 pt)	The date of each of your articles is discussed appropriately:  For example: "This article was published in November 2010, and covers new advances in treatments of Rabies." (2 pts)	You explain why the publication date for each of your articles enhances or at the very least does not hinder the credibility of your source:  For Example: "This article was published in November 2010, and covers new advances in the treatment of rabies. Since the article covers new advances in treating rabies, it is important that the article has a recent publication date since the topic of the article relates to new discoveries. Having a publication date only 2 months old makes this article very credible."  OR  "This article was published in December, 2001. Although it was written nine years ago, it was written by one of the pioneers of stem cell research and contains critical information on how stem cells were first isolated. Even though the article is not current, it is still very relevant and credible." (3 pt)
	Your journals are not discussed or are discussed poorly:  "This article was published in <i>The Astrophysical Journal</i> , so it must be reliable" (1 pt)	You make an appropriate case for the credibility of each of your source journals or publications:  For example: "This article was published in <i>The Astrophysical Journal</i> which is a scholarly, peer-reviewed journal. Therefore it is a credible source." (2 pts)	Your description of the credibility of each of your source journals or publications is convincing.  For example: "This article was published in <i>The Astrophysical Journal</i> which is a scholarly, peer-reviewed journal. According to their web site "Many of the classic discoveries of the twentieth century have first been reported in the <i>Journal</i> ." This is very definitely a credible source. (3 pts)
	The author's background is poorly discussed:  For example:  ("The author has a Phd so the author must be credible") (1 pt)	The author's background is generally discussed for each article:  For example: "The author or this article has a recent Phd from the University of Washington in Atmospheric Chemistry which makes the author credible to write on climate science" (2 pts)	The author's background is discussed in detail for each article:  ("The author or this article is a professor of Anthropology at Harvard University and is the president of the American Anthropological Society. Clearly the author is knowledgeable and credible to write on anthropology") (3 pts)