Research and Response Rubric

Collection of evidence/investigation	● Provides specific, thorough evidence from a variety of sources for own argument. At least one source is scholarly and the reliability of each is explained clearly. ● Specific evidence is provided for opposing viewpoints (evaluation section). ● All sources are cited at the end of the paper in a bibliography.	● Provides thorough evidence from a variety of sources for own argument. At least one source is scholarly and the reliability of each is explained clearly. ● Some evidence is provided for opposing viewpoints (evaluation section). ● All sources are cited at the end of the paper in a bibliography.	● Does not provide evidence from a variety of sources for own argument. ● Does not use a scholarly source. Reliability of sources not explained clearly. ● Very little or no evidence is provided for opposing viewpoints (evaluation section). ● All sources are not cited at the end of the paper in a bibliography.	● Does not provide evidence and/or sources for own argument are not reliable. ● Does not use a scholarly source. Reliability of sources not explained. ● No evidence is provided for opposing viewpoints (evaluation section). ● No sources are cited at the end of the paper in a bibliography.
Comments				
Analysis and Evaluation of Evidence	● Frames argument using an appropriate economic model/theory. ● Expertly explains the relationship between evidence and argument. ● Use of economic models is clear in analysis and includes at least one graph. Relationship between graph and argument is explained clearly. ● Thoroughly evaluates the quality of the argument (evaluation section) with evidence and one of the following techniques: evaluates sources, makes counterargument, distinguishes long-run effects vs. short-run effects, explains stakeholder effects.	● Frames argument using an appropriate economic model/theory. ● Explains clearly the relationship between evidence and argument at least once. ● Use of economic models is clear in analysis and includes at least one graph. Relationship between graph and argument is explained, but not clearly. ● Evaluates the quality of the argument (evaluation section) with evidence and one of the following techniques: evaluates sources, makes counterargument, distinguishes long-run effects vs. short-run effects, explains stakeholder effects.	● Does not frame the argument using an appropriate economic model/theory. ● Attempts to explain the relationship between evidence and argument, but unclearly. ● Use of economic models is not clear in analysis and/or does not include at least one graph. Relationship between graph and argument is not explained. ● Attempts to evaluate the quality of the argument (evaluation section) with evidence and one of the following techniques: evaluates sources, makes counterargument, distinguishes long-run effects vs. short-run effects, explains stakeholder effects. However, explanation is unclear.	● Does not frame the argument using an appropriate economic model/theory. ● Does not explain the relationship between evidence and argument, but unclearly. ● Does not use economic models and a graph. ● Does not evaluate the quality of the argument (evaluation section) with evidence and/or does not use one of the following techniques: evaluates sources, makes counterargument, distinguishes long-run effects vs. short-run effects, explains stakeholder effects. However, explanation is unclear.
Comments				