**University of Redlands, School of Education**
**EDUC 637 Common Rubric - Final Paper**
 **2016-2017**

| Introduction | Aggregate Scores |
|---|---|
| Poor: The paper either has no discernible introduction or the introduction offered does little to define the body of literature to be reviewed. Alternatively, the introduction may completely neglect to introduce the reader to anything resembling an original argument or to anything that could be considered an appropriate answer to the "so what?" question. | 8.70% |
| Satisfactory: The paper has an introduction that clearly defines the body of literature to be reviewed. The introduction does introduce the reader to the author's original perspective, but that perspective may be a bit fuzzy or unclear in the introduction. The answer to the "so what?" question may not be fully articulated in the introduction, but the introduction nevertheless does an adequate job of setting up the ensuing analysis. | 65.22% |
| Excellent: The paper begins with a coherent and articulate introduction that clearly defines the body of literature to be reviewed and introduces the reader to the author's original perspective on this literature (the author's own argument about the literature and what it says). The paper also clearly makes an argument about why the literature under review is important. In other words, this paper clearly answers the question: "so what?" | 26.09% |

| Original Argument | Aggregate Scores |
|---|---|
| Poor: The paper either has no discernible introduction or the introduction offered does little to define the body of literature to be reviewed. Alternatively, the introduction may completely neglect to introduce the reader to anything resembling an original argument or to anything that could be considered an appropriate answer to the "so what?" question. The paper has no discernible original argument or, perhaps, a very weak or incoherent one. The author may do a fine job of summarizing sources, but the paper seems to have very little of its own to say about these sources and how they relate to one another and the topic under study. The paper may read more like an annotated bibliography in which sources are discussed in a "laundry list" fashion rather than an appropriate literature review. | 0.00% |
| Satisfactory: The paper has an argument, but the argument may not be completely original, may not be particularly thoughtful, and/or may "disappear" at times throughout the paper due to the author's failure to link sources to this argument. | 73.91% |
| Excellent: The paper clearly makes an original, thoughtful, and perhaps even innovative argument. The argument clearly comes from the author and is not merely a restatement of arguments and observations that others have made about the literature in question. Throughout the paper, the reader is frequently reminded of this central argument and the literature discussed is adeptly linked to the argument. | 26.09% |

| Organization and Flow | Aggregate Scores |
|---|---|
| Poor: The paper's organization may be confusing or incoherent. The paper likely lacks appropriate "signposting" so that the reader is often confused about how pieces of the paper relate to one another. This paper is likely difficult to read. | 0.00% |
| Satisfactory: The paper generally is intuitively organized, although the reader may become lost in a few places due to inadequate "signposting." On rare occasions the author may allow the reader to lose track of the overarching argument. It may be unclear at times how the pieces of the literature review relate to one another or how one or two parts of the literature review relate to and/or serve to strengthen and bolster the author's original argument. | 78.26% |
| Excellent: The paper includes clear "signposting" and the writing allows the reader to clearly connect each section of the review to the overarching theme or argument. The paper is organized in an intuitive fashion. | 21.74% |

| Discussion of Sources | Aggregate Scores |
|---|---|
| Poor: This paper fails to draw on a sufficiently substantial body of peer-reviewed work. The author may also demonstrate a lack of understanding about what "peer-reviewed" research is by relying on sources that are journalistic or otherwise non-academic in nature. The paper may have serious shortcomings when it comes to discussing or summarizing the sources it uses. It may rely far too heavily on direct quotation from the works being reviewed. It may not be clear to the reader that the author actually understands the arguments being presented in the works s/he is discussing. It may also seem to the reader that the author has not properly read many of the sources s/he discusses. | 0.00% |
| Satisfactory: The paper draws on a body of peer-reviewed scholarship that, while of an adequate size, could be strengthened by the inclusion of additional sources. This paper may discuss a substantial number of sources but overlook one or more major works. The paper generally does a good job of articulately summarizing the sources under review but in one or two places the author may be guilty of over-quotation and/or may not seem to understand the works being summarized. | 73.91% |
| Excellent: The paper draws on a substantial body of peer reviewed scholarship. The review succeeds at summarizing the ideas and arguments in this scholarship in an articulate and succinct manner. The author of the paper clearly understands the sources s/he cites. The paper discusses the sources in a sophisticated way and does not overly rely on direct quotation. | 26.09% |

| Appropriateness of Implications | Aggregate Scores |
|---|---|
| Poor: The paper may include a section purporting to address the implications of the literature for the area of study, but if so this section is weak and underdeveloped. This may mean that the section does not actually discuss implications at all or that the implications discussed are unreasonable or unrealistic. It may be clear to the reader that this section was simply "tacked-on" or that the author did not think carefully about the literature and its possible meaning(s) for their area of study. To the extent that this paper addresses implications at all, this discussion does not reflect a sophisticated understanding of the topic. | 4.35% |
| Satisfactory: This paper effectively addresses some of the implications of the literature for higher education today. Generally, the implications discussed are reasonable and realistic, but the discussion may be lacking in some ways. There may be major or somewhat obvious implications that are overlooked. A small number of implications may be somewhat unreasonable or not terribly realistic. Overall, it is clear that the author has thought carefully about the implications of the literature s/he reviewed, and the discussion of implications reflects a good understanding of the topic. | 73.91% |
| Excellent: The paper does an impressive job of addressing the implications of the literature under review for the area of study. The implications may be abstract, practical, or both. Whatever the case, it is clear in this paper that the author has thought carefully and creatively about this section and the implications discussed are reasonable and reflect an exceptional, sophisticated, and multi-layered understanding of the topic. | 21.74% |

| Conclusion | Aggregate Scores |
|---|---|
| Poor: This paper's conclusion is either too simple or non-existent. If there is a conclusion at all, it fails to summarize the main themes and arguments of the literature review or does so incoherently. | 4.35% |
| Satisfactory: The paper does have a conclusion that addresses both the main themes of the paper and the argument(s) of the review. Generally, this conclusion does a good job of addressing these issues and tying things together for the reader. However, the conclusion's discussion of these issues may be insufficiently developed, unclear, or inconsistent with arguments and ideas presented earlier in the paper. | 73.91% |
| Excellent: The paper ends with a conclusion that articulately summarizes the main themes and argument(s) of the literature review. | 21.74% |

| Quality of Writing | Aggregate Scores |
|---|---|
| Poor: The paper may be poorly-written, insufficiently proofread, and/or rife with unnecessary mistakes (spelling, grammar, etc.). The writing in places may be so muddled that the reader struggles to understand what is being said. | 8.70% |
| Satisfactory: The paper is generally well-written and the reader rarely if ever struggles to understand what is being communicated. Although this paper may contain some spelling or grammatical errors, these errors are minimal and not overly distracting. Despite these errors, the paper was clearly proofread and not simply thrown together. | 65.22% |
| Excellent: The writing is clear, cogent, and professional. The paper has few if any grammatical or spelling errors and is carefully proofread. | 26.09% |

| Adherence to APA Citation Style | Aggregate Scores |
|---|---|
| Poor: The paper fails to adhere to APA citation style. It may be unclear to the reader which ideas in the paper come from which sources. | 8.70% |
| Satisfactory: The paper adheres to APA citation style but may contain some errors. Some sources listed in the reference page may not be parenthetically cited or vice versa. There may be some errors. | 65.22% |
| Excellent: The paper cites all sources appropriately in text and in a separate reference page. There are few if any errors in the application of APA style. | 26.09% |