<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds expectations</th>
<th>Meets expectations</th>
<th>Nearly meets expectations</th>
<th>Does not meet expectations</th>
<th>Did not attempt/No evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title**
- Cover page contains your name, date, and a catchy/clever title
- Cover page contains your name, date and a sufficient title
- Missing one element from Standard 2
- Missing more than one element Standard 2
- No cover page

**Introduction (Hook paragraph & thesis statement)**
- Clearly and concisely states the paper's purpose and policy proposal in 2-3 engaging sentences that are identifiable in the first 1-3 pages
- Clearly states the paper's purpose and policy proposal
- States the purpose/policy proposal of the paper but is somewhat unclear or appears much too late in the paper
- Incomplete and/or unfocused and/or has purpose but no policy proposal
- Absent and/or unfocused and/or missing purpose and/or policy proposal

**Research Essay Introductory paragraphs**
- Introductory paragraphs provide concise, extensive background so that the reader understands the context of the biological research topic.
- Introductory paragraphs provide sufficient background so that the reader understands the context of the biological research topic.
- Introductory paragraphs provide does not successfully describe the context of the research paper.
- Introductory paragraphs are vague or under-developed.
- Did not attempt

**Research Essay Body**
- Describes the physiological issue in extensive detail using scientific terminology. Describes clear links between typical and atypical physiology. Supported by scholarly evidence. Body is written in a logical, coherent fashion.
- Describes the physiological issue in sufficient detail using scientific terminology. Describes typical and atypical physiology. Supported by scholarly evidence. Body is written in a logical, coherent fashion.
- Description of the physiological issue lacks detail and is incoherently written or lacks scientific terminology. Supported by scholarly evidence.
- Description of physiological issue is vague and/or not supported by sufficient evidence. Lacks scientific terminology. Formatting and organization needs significant work.
- Body is written incoherently with poor formatting, organization and grammar.

**Research Essay Conclusion**
- Purposefully links the thesis to the policy in extensive detail. Transitions clearly and seamlessly to the policy proposal using scientific language.
- Purposefully links the thesis to the policy paper in sufficient detail. Transitions clearly to the policy proposal using some scientific language.
- Attempts to link the thesis to the policy paper, but lacks detail. Attempts to transition to the policy paper. Does not use scientific language.
- Makes no attempt to link the thesis to the policy paper. Does not use scientific language.
- Does not attempt
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Executive Summary</strong></th>
<th>Engaging, draws the reader in; includes the thesis; sets out the reasoning about why topic is a &quot;problem&quot; that needs fixed.</th>
<th>States the main purpose and thesis, but is not creative and dances around the reason that the policy topic is problematical.</th>
<th>Alludes to the topic, but is not engaging and does not include an identifiable thesis.</th>
<th>No clear and delineated intro, thesis is missing.</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Body (Historical Background, Policy Statement, Proposals for Change) (up to 20 points for this section)</strong></td>
<td>Is well-organized; Includes thorough history of topic, thorough discussion of current policies and scholarly debates about the topic, clear articulation of feasible and defensible policy proposal.</td>
<td>Is mostly well-organized; includes decent historical discussion; discussion of current policies may be a bit superficial; scholarly debates present but not necessarily linked to sources; policy proposal not defended but feasible.</td>
<td>Organization is troubling; treatment of history is cursory; policy proposal is neither plausible nor defended; scholarly debate is missing.</td>
<td>Organization is so sloppy that paper is hard to follow; one or more elements of policy proposal history, or scholarly debate are missing.</td>
<td>If you don't have a body, you don't have a paper!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of Idea/Support for Ideas</strong></td>
<td>Policy solution is obviously well-developed and based in an excellent understanding of social welfare problems and policy, government structure and power; policy solution is obviously supported by research and physiological evidence; development of argument is logical and transitions enhance clarity.</td>
<td>Policy solution is tentatively asserted and is mostly supported by research and based in a decent understanding of social welfare problems and policy, current government structure and power and physiological evidence; development of argument is sound but sometimes difficult to follow; transitions solid but not seamless.</td>
<td>Policy solution is very basic and not based in a thorough understanding of social welfare problems and policy, current government structure and power or physiological evidence; policy solution is tentatively based in research; transitions are convoluted and interfere with development of idea.</td>
<td>Policy solution is not possible and/or is not grounded in any understanding of social welfare problems and policy, current government structure/power or physiological evidence; transitions are weak.</td>
<td>No evidence of attempt to articulate policy solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>The conclusion is engaging and encourages reader to &quot;think some more&quot;.</td>
<td>The conclusion is clear and present.</td>
<td>The conclusion doesn't seem to wrap up the paper.</td>
<td>The conclusion is not conclusive and/or is hard to identify.</td>
<td>No conclusion present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics/Usage</td>
<td>Few if any errors in sentence structure, organization, spelling, capitalization, punctuation. Beautiful language and sophisticated word/verb choice.</td>
<td>Several errors in the categories mentioned in column 1. Writing is terse and not overly poetic, but appropriate and clear.</td>
<td>Significant errors in punctuation, organization, spelling interferes with clarity of the ideas. Word/verb choice is elementary and repetitive.</td>
<td>Mechanics are so rough as to thoroughly distract from the articulation of the ideas.</td>
<td>Writing is illegible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations/Sources</td>
<td>Research essay: at least 3 scholarly sources; does not exceed the Internet source limit; all Internet sources are scholarly. Policy Paper: has all 8 sources for the policy paper; all Internet sources are reliable sources; citation format follows APA Manual of Style perfectly; all direct quotes are cited; references section present and in correct format.</td>
<td>Research essay: Has 3 scholarly sources for the research essay (not exceeding the Internet source limit). Policy paper: has 7-10 sources for the policy paper; 1-2 Internet sources seem suspect; citation format followed with perhaps a couple of errors; all direct quotations are cited; references section present and in correct format.</td>
<td>Research essay: Has 3 scholarly sources for the research essay; exceeds the Internet source limit for the research essay OR uses non-scholarly internet sources; Policy paper: has 5-7 sources; not enough sources and too much reliance on unreliable Internet sources; citation format rough and incomplete; some quotes are not cited directly; difficult to understand which sources ideas are emanating from; references section present but some formatting trouble.</td>
<td>Research essay: Has less than scholarly sources; Policy paper: Sources are 5 or fewer; footnotes are in incorrect format and/or are not adequate.</td>
<td>No References Section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References (APA format)</td>
<td>Present and in correct format.</td>
<td>Present and in correct format.</td>
<td>Present with formatting inconsistencies.</td>
<td>Incomplete.</td>
<td>No References Section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>