

NCATE Assessment System

Score	Area (<i>Element</i>)	Target (3 pts)	Acceptable (2 pt)	Unacceptable (1 pts)
	Peer Review Articles (<i>II.A, II.B</i>)	8 peer review articles (primary research)	5-7 peer review articles	Articles not from peer review journals/research
	APA Style (<i>IV.B, V.A</i>)	1-2 errors in article reference and 1-2 errors in text citation	2-6 errors throughout paper and on article references page	Many errors in references and in text
	Research Review Format (<i>II.A, II.B, V.A, V.C</i>)	All 8 articles integrated into paper	5-7 articles integrated into paper	Articles not integrated into paper
	Connections & Transitions	Connections between articles made with proper transitions and representation of what is known.	Weak connections, transitions, or poor representation of what is known	No/flawed connections and transitions, reader cannot tell what is known
	Body Part 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe studies in detail (your judgment of what the studies show, and where to go from here) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Studies described but few details 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> some studies described
	Body Part 2 and Part 3	Describe each article (or each line of research, depending on what makes sense), then compare them. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compare and evaluate studies Comparisons are essential; descriptions alone are not illuminating. What do you compare? The possibilities include: research assumptions, research theories tested, hypotheses stated, research designs used, variables selected (independent and dependent), equipment used, instructions given, results obtained, interpretation of results, researcher speculations about future studies. Your job is to determine which factors are relevant. All studies have strengths and weaknesses. Finding them will help you make meaningful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some studies compared but not all 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flawed comparisons

	<p>Body Part 4 and Part 5</p> <p>Total 5-15 points (II.A, II.B, V.A)</p>	<p>comparisons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss implications of studies. Based on your comparisons, evaluate the work done in the area you are researching. State its strengths, weaknesses, and what remains to be done. Your assertions must be well supported by evidence. Then recommend future studies (specify how future work would add to that already done). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited evaluations, conclusions and recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited evaluations or conclusions or recommendations
	<p>Own Words (IV.A, VI.B)</p>	<p>Used own words and constructions instead of multiple paragraphs of quotations</p>	<p>Several one-line quotations</p>	<p>Many quotations (<i>plagiarism will earn an "F"</i>)</p>
	<p>Introduction part 1</p> <p>Introduction part 2</p> <p>Introduction part 3</p> <p>Total 3-9 points</p>	<p>The research question is introduced (what it is, why it is worth examining)</p> <p>The research question is narrowed to the studies discussed.</p> <p>The organization of the paper is briefly outlined (for example, if there is a major controversy in this literature, briefly describe it and state that you will present research supporting first one side, then the other. Or, if three methodologies have been used to address the question, briefly describe them and then state that you will compare the results obtained by the three methods). i.e. an overview of all the issues addressed in the paper and the importance of the question being addressed</p>	<p>The research question is introduced (what it is, why it is worth examining)</p> <p>The research question is narrowed to some extent.</p> <p>Overview of most of the issues addressed in the paper and the importance of the question being addressed</p>	<p>The research question is introduced (what it is, why it is worth examining) Some hint that the topic is limited.</p> <p>Overview does not cover areas addressed in paper or fails to establish the importance of the question</p>

	<i>(II.A., II.B, IV.A)</i>			
	Conclusion/Summary <i>(II.A, II.B, IV.A, IV.B, V.A, V.C)</i>	Conclusions flow reasonably from the information you gathered - Summary of what is known	Conclusion flows from the majority of information - Summary of most of what is known	Conclusion not cohesive with gathered information, or no conclusion at all - summary incomplete
	Review of Sources <i>(II.A, II.B, IV.A, IV.B, V.A, V.C)</i>	Analysis draws upon an adequate review of relevant sources	Review of relevant sources mostly adequate	Review of relevant sources not adequate

Breakdown of above ratings:

II.A	II.A	II.A	II.A	II.A	II.A	II.B
II.B	II.B	II.B	II.B	II.B	IV.A	IV.A
IV.A	IV.A	IV.B	IV.B	IV.B	V.A	V.A
V.A	V.A	V.A	V.C	V.C	V.C	VI.B

Some ideas used for this rubric comes from : UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
Psychology Writing Center Phone: 206.685.8278
3937 15th Avenue NE psywc@u.washington.edu
Box 351525 <http://depts.washington.edu/psywc/handouts.shtml>