Total: 100 marks	100 = Excellent	80 = Adequate	60 = Marginal	40 = Poor
Motivation/Literature (18 marks)				
Introduction	Introduction provides complete overview of paper, motivates research question using sources	Introduction provides some overview of paper, motivation clear with limited sources	Introduction vague; motivation minimal	Incomplete introduction, no motivation
Research question	Research question well identified, specific	Research question stated, not specific	Research question vague, not answerable	Cannot identify research question in paper
Literature	Important literature discussed and linked to topic	Important literature included, not linked to research question/paper	Scattered lit. discussion, poorly linked to topic (missing or irrelevant papers)	Sparse literature, not linked to topic
Methodology/Analysis (30 marks)				
Data	Clear discussion of data sources and any data cleaning; data cleaned appropriately	Data sources referenced but incomplete discussion; some data issues overlooked	Limited discussion of data	No discussion of data sources or cleaning
Empirical methods	Methodology discussed and empirical methods applied correctly	Methodology generally correct, with some issues overlooked	Major errors in empirical methods	Fundamental misunderstanding of empirical methods/no microdata used
Discussion of results	Results discussed and interpreted clearly	Results discussed, but inadequate interpretation	Results presented without interpretation	Poor discussion of results, no interpretation
Choice of evidence	Presented evidence addresses research question, is well utilized	Presented evidence related, only partially addresses research question	Evidence related, but not directly relevant to research question.	Evidence does not address research question
Figures and tables	Figures and tables appropriate to analysis, easy to interpret	Appropriate figures/tables included, difficult to interpret	Irrelevant figures/tables included or key figures/tables missing	Insufficient figures/tables, poorly presented
Limitations	Limitations discussed and minimized through analysis	Limitations discussed, few steps to minimize	Incomplete discussion of limitations	No discussion of limitations
Conclusions/interpretation (18 marks)				
Conclusions	Clear presentation of conclusions, qualifications, consequences, and contributions	Conclusions established, limited discussion implications and contributions	Fails to make clear conclusions, limited discussion of interpretation/contributions	Cannot discern conclusions
Critical thinking	Demonstrates independent and critical thinking	Demonstrates some independent and critical thinking	Limited evidence of independent and critical thinking	No evidence of independent and critical thinking
Argumentation	Assertions are qualified and well supported	Most assertions are qualified and well supported	Assertions are overly strong or unsupported	Assertions made in contrast to evidence or without evidence

Total: 100 marks	100 = Excellent	80 = Adequate	60 = Marginal	40 = Poor
Written presentation (24 marks)				
Organization	Well organized, easy to understand	Good organization, some parts out of place	Unclear organization	Disorganized, impedes understanding
Writing style	Clear and easy to read	Awkward or wordy writing, clear planning	Readable but difficult to follow	Difficult to understand
Grammar	Few grammatical and typographical errors	Some grammatical and typographical errors, but do not impede understanding	Moderate grammatical errors/typos	Frequent errors impede understanding
Formatting	Meets all formatting requirements	Minor deviation from formatting requirements	Exceeds page limit/major deviation from formatting requirements	Formatting requirements completely disregarded
Replication code (10 marks)				
Do-files and log	Well-documented, easy to read	Detailed documentation, somewhat confusing	Unclear documentation	Little to no documentation

I will weight sub-items in order to sum to total marks