Paper Evaluation Template

Student:

**Introduction/Thesis:**

Introduction:

Does the introduction lay out a clear plan for answering the question? Do they have a clear hypothesis and line of argument to address it?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Good | Adequate | Marginal | Poor |
| Clear topic- q. of pressing importance |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear objective |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feasible question |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feasible scope |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear plan – 2-4 steps of analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear hypothesis |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear line of argument to address it |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall |  |  |  |  |  |

Comments:

**Analysis**

*Literature Review*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Good | Adequate | Marginal | Poor |
| Incorporation of class material |  |  |  |  |  |
| Knowledge of historical, political & economic context |  |  |  |  |  |
| Use of academic books and articles vs. internet sources |  |  |  |  |  |
| Knowledge of the issue |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall |  |  |  |  |  |

Comments:

*Analysis- data*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Good | Adequate | Marginal | Poor |
| Objective, unemotional approach |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spectrum of approaches and counter-arguments considered |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear set of assertions linked to thesis & evidence |  |  |  |  |  |
| Appropriate use of reliable data (events and stats) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Original point of view (vs. cut and paste) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Well-organized- modularity & flow |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall |  |  |  |  |  |

Comments:

**Conclusion**

Does the paper contain a clear conclusion that comes naturally from the literature review, evidence, and logical analysis? Are there clear recommendations/results from the analysis? Does the conclusion have a clear recommendation that is feasible and politically pragmatic?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Good | Adequate | Marginal | Poor |
| Clear conclusion |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fits with thesis |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flows logically from evidence |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acknowledges limits |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clear and feasible recommendation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall |  |  |  |  |  |

Comments:

**Style/Formatting**

Is the paper formatted professionally? Any spelling or grammar errors? Any problems with style? Does the author use an economy of words, avoiding repetition? Does the author use an active as opposed to a passive voice?

Do the different parts of the paper flow together to answer the question? Is the analysis well-embedded with the interpretation? Is the paper appropriately written for the audience (an expert)?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Good | Adequate | Marginal | Poor |
| Professional formatting |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spelling and grammar |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pleasing to eye |  |  |  |  |  |
| Active not passive voice |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flow throughout paper |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis well-embedded w/interpretation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Written for an expert audience |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bibliography well-documented & formatted |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall |  |  |  |  |  |

Comments:

**Overall Grade: Late Penalty: Final Grade:**