

IRAPS – Rubric for Review of Abstracts

Research – page 1

Philosophy – page 2

RESEARCH ABSTRACT EVALUATION RUBRIC

EVALUATION COMPONENTS	UNSATISFACTORY (0-1 POINTS)	SATISFACTORY (2-3 POINTS)	OUTSTANDING (4-5 POINTS)
INTRODUCTION	The subject and purpose are not obvious.	Author describes the main subject and purpose of the research/project and indicates why the research/project is important...	...and places the research/project in a larger topical context.
METHODS	Methods are not obvious.	Author describes what they did: data sources and methods of data collection are provided...	...and convinces the reader that the methods employed were appropriate to the research/project.
RESULTS	Results are not presented clearly.	Author describes what they learned, and provides outcomes for the main results <i>or</i> an explanation of why no results were achieved...	...and relates the results to the research/project question.
CONCLUSION	Conclusion is unclear.	Author describes the correlation between the research/project and its results, and the conclusions, anticipated or final, that they draw from the research/project...	...and describes how this work will contribute to the field.
LANGUAGE AND CONVENTIONS	The abstract is wordy and nonspecific.	The author uses profession terminology, concise language and cites specific details...	...and makes no errors in language use or conventions, all acronyms are defined when first used. Congruent with Sherman College's lexicon.
RELEVANCE	The study is not consistent with subluxation-based chiropractic or the mission of Sherman College.	The study is consistent with subluxation-based chiropractic and the mission of Sherman College.	... and is designed to reveal novel and clinically useful information, and will be of particular interest to attendees.

*Adapted from rubric by Bowling Green State University: <https://www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/provost/center-undergraduate-research-scholarship/documents/ResearchAbstractRubric.pdf>

PHILOSOPHY **ABSTRACT EVALUATION RUBRIC**

EVALUATION COMPONENTS	UNSATISFACTORY (0-1 POINTS)	SATISFACTORY (2-3 POINTS)	OUTSTANDING (4-5 POINTS)
THESIS	There is no thesis.	The thesis is obvious, but there is no single clear statement of it.	A clear statement of the main conclusion of the paper.
PREMISES	There are no premises—the paper merely restates the thesis. Or, if there are premises, they are much more likely to be false than true.	The premises are all clear, although each may not be presented in a single statement. It is also pretty clear which premises are to be taken as given, and which will be supported by sub-arguments. The paper provides sub-arguments for controversial premises. If there are sub-arguments, the premises for these are clear. The premises which are taken as given are at least plausibly true.	Each reason for believing the thesis is made clear, and as much as possible, presented in single statements. It is also clear which premises are to be taken as given, and which will be supported by sub-arguments. The paper provides sub-arguments for controversial premises. If there are sub-arguments, the premises for these are clear, and made in single statements. The premises which are taken as given are at least plausibly true.
SUPPORT	The premises do not support the thesis.	The premises support the thesis, and the author is aware of the general kind of support they provide. The argument is either valid as it stands, or, if invalid, the thesis, based on the premises, is likely to be or plausibly true.	The premises clearly support the thesis, and the author is aware of exactly the kind of support they provide. The argument is either valid as it stands, or, if invalid, the thesis, based on the premises, is likely to be or plausibly true.
ANALYSIS	The parts identified are not the correct and/or relevant ones. The connections between the parts are completely inaccurate.	The paper successfully breaks the argument, issue, or problem into relevant parts. The connections between the parts are fairly accurate.	The paper successfully breaks the argument, issue, or problem into relevant parts. The connections between the parts are clear and highly accurate.
SYNTHESIS	The parts to be integrated are not clear and/or relevant. The connections between the parts are unclear.	The paper integrates most relevant parts from various places into a mostly coherent whole. The connections between the parts are generally clear.	The paper successfully integrates all relevant parts from various places into a coherent whole. The connections between the parts are clear and insightful.
RELEVANCE	The topic is not consistent with subluxation-based chiropractic or the mission of Sherman College.	The topic is consistent with subluxation-based chiropractic and the mission of Sherman College.	... and will be of particular interest to attendees.

*Adapted from rubric by Carnegie Mellon: <https://www.cmu.edu/teaching/resources/Teaching/CourseDesign/Assessment-Grading/Rubrics/PhilosophyPaperRubric.doc>