

20p280 RPPv2 Rubric

No hard copy submitted: -5  
 RPPv2 submitted late: -15

No writer's memo: -10  
 No RPPv1 attached: -12

Features	Description	Range	Comments for 2–3 Main Features
<b>Research Question &amp; Thesis Statement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● If RPPv1 was marked PASS, research question and thesis statement are identical to RPPv1 (if modified, speak with TA)</li> <li>● If RPPv1 was marked HOLD, research question and thesis statement have been substantially revised and reflect the discussion between student and TA.</li>   <li>● Research question has a well-defined problem to investigate</li> <li>● Thesis statement answers the research question in an informed way</li> <li>● Both research question and answering thesis are well focused and have potential for technical and policy aspects</li> </ul>	10%  <b>High</b>  <b>Mid</b>  <b>Low</b>	
<b>Introduction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provides a context for the problem being investigated (what is it? why does it matter? what's your angle / how are you approaching it?)</li> <li>● Implies or states a research question</li> <li>● Answers research question directly with a clear, arguable, interesting, and informed thesis</li> <li>● Forecasts the organization of the body of the report in a final sentence</li> </ul>	25%  <b>High</b>  <b>Mid</b>  <b>Low</b>	
<b>Outline</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Reflects chosen role</li> <li>● Logical progression of ideas</li> <li>● Outline is extended from RPPv1, with at least 7 bullet points</li> <li>● Each bullet point is followed by a citation</li> <li>● Ends with possible solution, recommended action, or policy proposal</li> </ul>	20%  <b>High</b>  <b>Mid</b>  <b>Low</b>	

**PASS**

**HOLD**

<b>Conclusion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The main recommendation is clearly identifiable (recommended action, policy proposal, possible solution) may, in addition and optionally, suggest directions for future research The recommendation is well justified, given the preceding analysis</li> <li>• The main recommendation should be credible, given the political conditions or technical capabilities discussed and--in the case of future research (optional addition)--identified gaps in the knowledge of the community of experts</li> </ul>	20%  <b>High</b>  <b>Mid</b>  <b>Low</b>	
<b>References, Format, &amp; Length</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal is 2-3 pages in length, with additional separate page for references</li> <li>• At least <u>6</u> sources* with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ at least one relevant book, chapter from a book, or peer-reviewed paper (required)</li> <li>○ no more than two assigned readings</li> <li>○ no more than two high-quality newspaper/periodical articles</li> <li>○ no course slides or unapproved online sources</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Citations and references are accurately cited in American Psychological Association (APA) style, as specified by <a href="#">UOIS</a> Each reference is annotated with a 1-2 sentence description of how the reference is relevant and how it could be used in the research paper</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>*You will have added 3 if you had 3 min. sources for RPPv1</i></p>	20%  <b>High</b>  <b>Mid</b>  <b>Low</b>	
<b>Copy Editing &amp; Proofreading</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grammar and mechanics are edited for correctness and readability</li> </ul>	5%  <b>High</b>  <b>Mid</b>  <b>Low</b>	
<b>Overall Comments:</b>			