**Rubrics for the Stream Study Assignments**

**Assignment 1: Annotated Bibliography**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** |
| Literature Cited | All of the cited papers related directly to the assigned topic area; three or more papers were cited | Two or three papers were cited, one paper was loosely related to the topic area | Two papers were cited, both papers were loosely related to the topic area | Two papers were cited, at least one paper was not related to the topic or was from a non-refereed source | One or two papers were cited, all of the papers cited were not related to the topic or were from non-refereed sources |
|  | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| Annotations | Each paper was concisely summarized; the relevance of each paper to the research topic was made evident; cited papers were well compared | Each paper was summarized; attempts were made to discuss the relevance of each paper to the research topic; attempts were made to draw comparisons across cited papers | Each paper was summarized; attempts were made to discuss the relevance of each paper to the research topic; cited papers were not discussed relative to each other | Each paper was poorly summarized; little attempt was made to discuss the relevance of each paper to the research topic; cited papers were not discussed relative to each other | Each paper was poorly summarized; no further discussion of the relevance of each paper to the research topic or comparisons of the papers were included |
| Total [15] |  |  |  |  |  |

**Assignment 2: Research Question Assignment Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1 or 0** |
| Title | Concise well-written title that describes the study | Appropriate title that could use some refinement | Title describe the study, but is brief or too verbose | Title does not describe the study | Title is missing or inappropriate |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Literature Review** | **10** | **8** | **6** | **4** | **2** |
| Background | Extensive background was provided that presents a context for the question that is being investigated | Appropriate background information is provided and is clearly discussed with respect to the study question | Moderate background information is provided, but the link to the study question is unclear and/or extraneous information is included | Some background information is provided, but the link to the study question is unclear and/or extraneous information is included | Only general background information provided, and/or information provided is not relevant to the study question |
| General understanding of topic area | The background discussion demonstrated an excellent understanding of the topic | The background discussion demonstrated a good understanding of the topic | The background discussion demonstrated a good general understanding of the topic with minimal evident misinterpretations of the relevant literature | The background discussion demonstrated a general understanding of the topic with some misinterpretations of the relevant literature | The background discussion did not demonstrate an understanding of the topic |
| **Proposed Hypotheses** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1 or 0** |
| Testable | Study questions are clearly stated, appropriate and testable | Study questions are clearly stated and appropriate, but require some refinement to be testable | Not all the study questions are clearly stated and/or appropriate, and several require refinement to be testable | Few of the study questions are clearly stated and/or appropriate, and most require major refinement to be testable | No clear study questions are stated |
| Complexity | Study questions are complex and well-thought out | Study questions are appropriate but could use refinement | Study questions lack complexity but have potential to be expanded with respect to the literature discussed | Study questions are simplistic but with more literature research could be expanded | Trivial research question proposed |
| **Presentation** | **10** | **8** | **6** | **4** | **2** |
| Organization | Excellent organization, few to no grammatical errors | Good organization, few grammatical errors or awkward wording | Problematic organization, some sections were poorly structured and difficult to follow, some grammatical errors | Problematic organization, difficult to follow, awkward wording at times, some grammatical errors | Poorly organized, unable to follow progression of thought, many grammatical errors |
|  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1 or 0** |
| Literature Citations | Literature cited correctly, includes more than 5 articles from the primary literature, all papers appropriately cited in the text. | Cited in correct format with few errors, 5 articles from the primary literature cited, all papers appropriately cited in the text. | Cited in correct format with some errors, and/or 4 articles from the primary literature cited, some errors in citation of papers in the text. | Cited in correct format with many errors, and/or 3 or less articles from the primary literature cited, some errors in citation of papers in the text. | Minimal to no literature cited and/or improper sources cited, and/or improper citation in the text. |
| Total [50] |  |  |  |  |  |

**Assignment 3: Testing Your Hypotheses Assignment Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **10** | **8** | **6** | **4** | **2** |
| **Analysis Plan** | The planned analyses were appropriate, all variables were well described, sufficient detail was provided. | The planned analyses were appropriate, most variables were well described, and/or few details were missing. | One proposed analyses was incorrect, most variables were well described, and/or some details were missing. | The majority of the planned analyses were incorrect, variables were not described, and/or more details were required. | The analysis plan did not provide enough detail to understand how the data would be analyzed. |
| **Presentation** | **10** | **8** | **6** | **4** | **2** |
| Organization | Excellent organization, few to no grammatical errors | Good organization, few grammatical errors or awkward wording | Problematic organization, some sections were poorly structured and difficult to follow, some grammatical errors | Problematic organization, difficult to follow, awkward wording at times, some grammatical errors | Poorly organized, unable to follow progression of thought, many grammatical errors |
|  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1 or 0** |
| Literature Citations | Literature cited correctly, includes more than 5 articles from the primary literature, all papers appropriately cited in the text. | Cited in correct format with few errors, 5 articles from the primary literature cited, all papers appropriately cited in the text. | Cited in correct format with some errors, and/or 4 articles from the primary literature cited, some errors in citation of papers in the text. | Cited in correct format with many errors, and/or 3 or less articles from the primary literature cited, some errors in citation of papers in the text. | Minimal to no literature cited and/or improper sources cited, and/or improper citation in the text. |
| Total [25] |  |  |  |  |  |

**Assignment 4: Reporting Your Results and Interpretations Assignment Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Statistical Analysis** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1 or 0** |
| Appropriate Use of Statistics | All analyses were well executed, all statistics were appropriately reported in the text | Most analyses were well executed, minimal errors were evident in the statistics reported in the text | At least one inappropriate statistical analysis was conducted, some statistics were inappropriately reported in the text (e.g. standard errors were not reported) | More than one inappropriate statistical analysis was conducted, statistics were inappropriately reported in the text (e.g. standard errors were not reported) | No statistical analyses were performed |
| Complexity of Analysis | Multiple types of analyses were conducted and/or an extensive number of analyses were performed, and/or the complexity of the analyses exceeded the expectations for the course | An appropriate number of analyses were reported | At least one analyses was missing that would have contributed information to the study | Minimal basic analyses were performed | No statistical analyses were performed |
| **Results** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Well described | Results were concisely and clearly described and highlighted the major findings, no extraneous information was reported nor were results interpreted | Results were concisely and clearly described, some extraneous information was reported and/or results were interpreted | The description of the results was rambling, extraneous information was reported and/or results were interpreted | The description of the results was convoluted, and difficult to follow, extraneous information was reported and/or results were interpreted | The description of the results was minimal and unclear |
| Appropriate display of data | Appropriate number of informative tables or figures that highlight the key findings, and contain no extraneous information were included | Appropriate number of tables or figures were included, data was largely displayed appropriately | One table/figure is extraneous or lacking, and/or the data was inappropriately and/or was uninformative | More than one table/figure was extraneous or lacking, and/or the data was displayed inappropriately and/or was uninformative | Little to no tables/figures were presented, figures that were presented were incorrect |
| Format of Figures and Tables | Tables or figures were well labelled and include well written legends | Legends were brief and lack some key details, and/or labels were lacking | Legends were brief and/or labels were lacking | Legends were too brief or absent, and/or figures were poorly labelled | Little to no tables/figures were presented |
| **Discussion** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1 or 0** |
| Interpretation of results | Clear, concise and logical interpretation of the results, suggests next investigative steps, interpretation extends beyond a discussion of the methods/data reliability and discusses the implication of the results to the broader field, if methodological issues are raised they are discussed in light of their impact on the conclusions | Concise and clear interpretation of the results, interpretation briefly discusses the rationale for the study with respect to the broader field, but focuses primarily on the methods/data reliability | Discussion of the results is convoluted and fails to clearly discuss the rationale for the study with respect to the broader field and focuses primarily on the methods/data reliability | Discussion of the results is minimal ant the interpretation only focuses on the methods/data reliability | Little to no discussion of the research findings |
| Synthesis | Findings were discussed individually, and synthesized and led to an overall conclusion. | Findings were discussed individually, and synthesized but lacked an overall conclusion. | Findings were discussed individually with a moderate attempt to synthesize the findings | Findings were discussed individually with little attempt to synthesize the findings | Findings were discussed individually with no attempt to synthesize the findings |
| Use of literature | Extensive discussion of relevant literature to support acceptance or rejection of hypotheses | Good discussion of relevant literature to support acceptance or rejection of hypotheses | Moderate discussion of relevant literature, not all literature was appropriate or clearly explained | Moderate to little discussion of relevant literature, and/or little explanation of how cited literature related to the findings | Little to no discussion of relevant literature, papers were mentioned without further discussion |
| **Presentation** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1 or 0** |
| Organization | Excellent organization, few to no grammatical errors | Good organization, few grammatical errors or awkward wording | Problematic organization, some sections were poorly structured and difficult to follow, some grammatical errors | Problematic organization, difficult to follow, awkward wording at times, some grammatical errors | Poorly organized, unable to follow progression of thought, many grammatical errors |
| Literature Citations | Literature cited in correct format, includes more than 5 articles from the primary literature, all papers appropriately cited in the text. | Cited in correct format with few errors, 5 articles from the primary literature cited, all papers appropriately cited in the text. | Cited in correct format with some errors, and/or 4 articles from the primary literature cited, some errors in citation of papers in the text. | Cited in correct format with many errors, and/or 3 or less articles from the primary literature cited, some errors in citation of papers in the text. | Minimal to no literature cited and/or improper sources cited, and/or improper citation in the text. |
| Total [50] |  |  |  |  |  |