

Sedimentology Peer-Review rubric (ERS313 – Fall 2017)

Criteria	Excellent (~A)	Most Expectations (~B)	Some Expectations (~C)	Below Expectations (~D)
Title 1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title is creative, descriptive, and informative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title represents the project well 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title poorly explains or has little to do with the proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title is uninformative and distracting
Intro 3 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hypothesis is effectively explained Introduction is captivating and encourages further reading Introduction effectively outlines the proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hypothesis is well explained Introduction is interesting and encourages further reading Introduction outlines the proposal well 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hypothesis is poorly explained Introduction is uninspiring Introduction poorly outlines the proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hypothesis is not explained Introduction is disorganized and incoherent Introduction does not outline the proposal
Body 6 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Body paragraphs are exciting and effectively presented The temporal and geographic context of the proposal is effectively presented Research team carefully chosen and roles effectively explained Project details are explicit and allow for critical evaluation The type(s) of data collected are thoroughly explained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Body paragraphs are well presented The temporal and geographic context of the proposal is well presented Research team chosen well and roles are well explained Project details are sufficient to allow for critical evaluation Methods are well explained The type(s) of data collected are well explained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Body paragraphs are poorly presented The temporal and geographic context of the proposal is poorly presented Research team roles not well explained Project details are insufficient to allow for critical evaluation Methods are poorly explained The type(s) of data collected are poorly explained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Body paragraphs are disorganized and incoherent The temporal and geographic context of the proposal is not presented Research team cannot be expected to undertake the proposed project. Project details are lacking to allow for critical evaluation Methods are not explained The type(s) of data collected are not explained
Conclusion 3 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research hypothesis is creatively summarized Expected outcomes are effectively expressed Broader context of research proposal is clearly and realistically presented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research goals/hypotheses are well summarized Expected outcomes are well expressed Broader context of research proposal is well presented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research goals/hypotheses are summarized Expected outcomes are expressed Broader context of research proposal is presented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research goals/hypotheses are not summarized Expected outcomes are not expressed Broader context of research proposal is not presented
References 2 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least five primary sources are up to date, topical, and appropriate. Primary sources are used effectively throughout the proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most sources are up to date, topical, and appropriate. Primary sources are used throughout the proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some sources are up to date, topical, and appropriate. Primary sources are poorly used throughout the proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few sources are up to date, topical, and appropriate. Primary sources are used throughout the proposal