

Please cite as: Fuller, K.S., & Saint-Louis, N. (2016). *Research Essay and Policy Paper Integrated Writing Assignment*. Guttman Community College (CUNY).

	<b>Exceeds expectations</b> <b>4</b>	<b>Meets expectations</b> <b>3</b>	<b>Nearly meets expectations</b> <b>2</b>	<b>Does not meet expectations</b> <b>1</b>	<b>Did not attempt/No evidence</b> <b>0</b>
<b>Title</b>	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
<b>Introduction (Hook paragraph &amp; thesis statement)</b>	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
<b>Research Essay Introductory paragraphs</b>	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
<b>Research Essay Body</b>	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.
<b>Research Essay Conclusion</b>	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

<b>Executive Summary</b>	Engaging, draws the reader in; includes the thesis; sets out the reasoning about why topic is a "problem" that needs fixed	States the main purpose and thesis, but is not creative and dances around the reason that the policy topic is problematical	Alludes to the topic, but is not engaging and does not include an identifiable thesis	No clear and delineated intro, thesis is missing	Absent
<b>Body (Historical Background, Policy Statement, Proposals for Change) (up to 20 points for this section)</b>	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	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	Organization is troubling; treatment of history is cursory; policy proposal is neither plausible nor defended; scholarly debate is missing	Organization is so sloppy that paper is hard to follow; one or more elements of policy proposal history, or scholarly debate are missing	If you don't have a body, you don't have a paper!
<b>Development of Idea/Support for Ideas</b>	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	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	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	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	No evidence of attempt to articulate policy solution
<b>Conclusion</b>	The conclusion is engaging and encourages reader to "think some more"	The conclusion is clear and present	The conclusion doesn't seem to wrap up the paper	The conclusion is not conclusive and/or is hard to identify	No conclusion present

<b>Mechanics/Usage</b>	Few if any errors in sentence structure, organization, spelling, capitalization, punctuation. Beautiful language and sophisticated word/verb choice	Several errors in the categories mentioned in column 1. Writing is terse and not overly poetic, but appropriate and clear.	Significant errors in punctuation, organization, spelling interferes with clarity of the ideas. Word/verb choice is elementary and repetitive.	Mechanics are so rough as to thoroughly distract from the articulation of the ideas	Writing is illegible.
<b>Citations/Sources</b>	<b>Research essay:</b> at least 3 scholarly sources; does not exceed the Internet source limit; all Internet sources are scholarly <b>Policy Paper:</b> 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	<b>Research essay:</b> Has 3 scholarly sources for the research essay (not exceeding the Internet source limit) <b>Policy paper:</b> 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	<b>Research essay:</b> Has 3 scholarly sources for the research essay; exceeds the Internet source limit for the research essay OR uses non-scholarly internet sources; <b>Policy paper:</b> 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	<b>Research essay:</b> Has less than scholarly sources; <b>Policy paper:</b> Sources are 5 or fewer; footnotes are in incorrect format and/or are not adequate	No References Section
<b>References (APA format)</b>	Present and in correct format	Present and in correct format	Present with formatting inconsistencies	Incomplete	No References Section