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|  | **5**  **Exceptional** | **4 Proficient** | **3 Satisfactory** | **2 Emerging** | **1 Unsatisfactory** | | **Score** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Content and Organization | Broad and in-depth grasp of the topic with thoughtful connections to relevant concepts; excellent presentation of ideas; insightful | Topic clearly relevant to field of study; carefully focused; well organized; sound scholarly argument | Topic clearly relevant to field of study; logically arranged; adequately organized to express desired concepts. | Topic is vaguely defined or poorly focused; poor organization restricts comprehensibility | Topic poorly defined or not relevant to field of study; lacks focus and organization; content may be plagiarized | |  | |
| Knowledge Base | Evidence of a broad, carefully evaluated knowledge base which includes synthesis of multiple theoretical perspectives relevant to the well thought out problem statement | Evidence of an expanding knowledge base which includes analysis of theoretical perspectives related to the problem statement | Evidence of a well-documented knowledge base related to the problem statement | Evidence of a narrow knowledge base marginally related to the problem statement | Little or no evidence of knowledge base; little or no connection to problem statement | |  | |
| Research Implementation | Well-chosen research design with respondent/participant information; clear validity/trustworthiness and rigor | Suitable research design with validity/trustworthiness and some rigor | Evidence of most parts of the selected research design, some validity/trustworthiness | Research design is vague or confusing; methodology is weak | Poor research design resulting in flawed methodology | |  | |
| Research Outcome | Excellent documentation of analysis and synthesis of the data with relevant propositions and recommendations | Good documentation of analysis and synthesis of the data with relevant propositions and recommendations | Some documentation of analysis and synthesis of the data with relevant propositions and recommendations | Some missing parts in the documentation of analysis and synthesis of the data | Outcome does not relate to the research questions | |  | |
| Style & Format (APA and AIIAS Standards) | Models language, style, and format of scholarly literature; publishable) | Style and format standards consistently applied; accurately documented | Few errors of style and format; most sources documented correctly | Inconsistent style and format; lacks precision in use of quotations and citation sources | Style and format standards not applied; sources plagiarized; clarity compromised by errors | |  | |
| Mechanics (spelling, grammar, punctuation, sentence structure) | Free of mechanical errors; smooth flow and effective transitions enhance strong scholarly communication | Few mechanical errors; strong transitions increase comprehensibility and improve flow of argument | Generally follows mechanical conventions, but with some minor errors; appropriate transitions | Frequent mechanical errors; missing or ineffective transitions and flow from point to point | Numerous mechanical errors, making comprehension almost impossible | |  | |
|  | | | | | | Total Score | |  | |
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