

NTR 629 Nutrition and Health Research Planning – Grading Rubric for Chapter 2

Elements: Scale: →	20% ³		50% ⁴	
	Body – Breadth/ Content Coverage ^{1,2}	Body – Content Depth ^{1,2}	Body – Content Accuracy	Body – Flow & Clarity
4 Excellent; Exceeds Requirements at an Exceptional Level	Relevant related principles are discussed to provide excellent topic coverage breadth. AND All relevant principles and subtopics included in discussion. For example include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant mechanisms (e.g., physiology, biochemistry, psychology, as appropriate). • Related subtopics. • As appropriate, results of studies in related areas of nutrition (e.g., if you are covering GI education, include results of CV & DM). 	Content coverage is in appropriate depth and detail. As appropriate, the biological, biochemical, physiological, and/or psychological (may include educational psychology or learning) mechanisms are discussed in <i>depth and detail</i> . Results of many relevant research studies are reported. AND As needed, tables are included in the appendix to identify relevant food sources and nutrients. AND Consistently addresses the appropriate audience (i.e., entry-level nutritionist/RD).	There are no errors of accuracy in content or description, including having no misleading statements and NO writer opinions. Minor errors are confined to 1 sentence; major errors extend into connected sentences or entire paragraph. Errors include unfounded opinions. NOTE: Errors of accuracy are often made when the appropriate type of reference isn't utilized, from incomplete research to fully understand concepts. Remember one study does not “prove”.	Logical progression of concepts. Within paper and subtopics, ideas proceed from general to specific. AND Transitions within each subtopic tie paragraphs together. AND Writing style is clear and concise (succinct). Does not use bullet points.
3.5 Very Good; Exceeds Requirements	Excellent topic coverage and all relevant subtopics included, BUT also includes an unrelated or irrelevant <i>subtopic</i> .	Areas/subtopics covered in appropriate depth and level, BUT 1-2 concepts slightly lacking depth (i.e., needing expansion/detail) OR 1-2 times slightly excessive information provided (e.g., too much detail about a single study)	1-2 minor errors.	Excellent logical progression with a couple of areas of redundancy. OR Logical progression the majority of the time (rarely “choppy”).
3 Good; Meets Minimal Standards	Excellent topic coverage and all relevant subtopics included, BUT also includes 2 unrelated or irrelevant <i>subtopics</i> .	Areas/subtopics covered in appropriate depth, BUT 3-4 concepts slightly lacking depth OR 3-4 times slightly excessive information provided OR Areas/subtopics covered in appropriate depth, BUT 1 area/subtopic signif. lacking depth	3 minor errors.	Needs slight reorganization of subtopics, but basic flow from one subtopic to next present. Not all paragraphs within subtitles flow in a natural and logical manner (occasionally “choppy”). May have a few areas of redundancy.
2 Fair; Below Minimal Standard; Does Not Meet Requirements; Revisions Needed; Writing below entry-level nutritionist/RD.		Slightly lacking depth/detail about areas/subtopics (s) as 5-6 concepts slightly lacking depth. OR 5-6 times concepts slightly excessive information provided AND 1 area/subtopic significantly lacking depth. OR 2 areas/subtopics significantly lacking depth.	4 minor errors. OR 1 major error.	Needs significant reorganization of subtopics and/or paragraphs (several paragraphs are “choppy”). OR Writing overly wordy and somewhat redundant. Sentences may run on OR overuse of quotations OR inappropriately using bullet points.
1 Poor; Significantly Below Standards; Needs Substantial Revisions	Entirely missing 1 relevant <i>topic (headers)</i> OR 3 or more irrelevant subtopics.	Areas/subtopics significantly lacking depth. > 6 concepts slightly lacking depth. OR >2 areas/subtopics significantly lacking depth.	5 minor errors. OR 1 major error and 1-2 minor errors	Many sentences do not flow in a logical manner. The paper appears to have little to no direction, with subtopics and paragraphs appearing disjointed.
0 Very Substandard or Absent	Entirely missing > 2 relevant <i>topics</i> .	Plagiarism. OR Excessive use of quotations.	> 5 minor errors. OR > 1 major error. OR 1 major error with > 2 minor error.	Writing is too convoluted to know what is trying to be expressed.

1. Plagiarism is rewarded with a 0% on the *entire* literature review assignment (chapter 2).
2. This assignment requires 15-20 concisely written pages; needed in order to reach appropriate content depth and breadth.
3. Re-submit your outline upon which the instructor &/or Thesis Advisor wrote comments
4. Accuracy, flow and clarity impact depth. Depth has most of the grade weight.

NTR 629 Nutrition and Health Research Planning – Grading Rubric for Chapter 2

	10%	10%	10%	Lose points if not formatted properly
Elements: Scale: →	Sentence Structure & Grammar	Spelling	References	Format of Manuscript
4 Excellent; Exceeds Requirements at an Exceptional Level	Includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of active voice when appropriate. • Written in 3rd person • Sentences correct grammatically (e.g., verb, no dangling modifiers) • Sentences correct mechanically (e.g., punctuation, capitalization, use of quotations correct if used) • Sentence structure varies. 	0-1 spelling errors.	Format correct: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources are cited when specific claims are made and results reported. • Sources are listed on a separate reference page. • Citations and reference page listings adhere to <i>J Amer Diet Assoc (JAMA)</i> format. 	Adheres to the <i>Thesis Manual</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate use and format of headers. • Appropriate use and format of subtitles. • Margins : 1" top, bottom and right margins ; 1.5" left margin • 12 pt. Font size. • Font: times roman, arial, or similar font style. • Double space (<i>only</i> – no extra spaces between paragraphs). • Left-justify (no paragraph indentations) • Page numbers centered and formatted correctly. • White paper.
3.5 Very Good; Exceeds Requirements	Sentence structure may be too repetitive. Only few errors in sentence mechanics and grammar.	2-3 spelling errors	1-3 individual errors. NOTE: Errors include improper or lack of citations within the body of the paper, and format (e.g., punctuation, italics, content, format for author name)	
3 Good; Meets Minimal Standards	Sentence structure may be too repetitive. Several errors in sentence mechanics and grammar.	4-5 spelling errors	4-6 individual errors.	1 of the following formatting errors: improper margin width, indentations, or extra spacing between paragraphs. (Minus 2.5 points)
2 Fair; Below Minimal Standard; Does Not Meet Requirements; Revisions Needed; Writing below entry-level nutritionist/RD.	Sentence structure too repetitive. Many errors in sentence mechanics and grammar. Comments such as "as previously stated".	6-7 spelling errors	7-12 individual errors OR 10-25% of references are newsletters &/or lay magazines &/or questionable web references &/or books (that are not written by author of the theory) OR less than 35 references	1 format error not listed in above cell, OR 2 total format components missing or in error. (Minus 5 points)
1 Poor; Significantly Below Standards; Needs Substantial Revisions	Written in 1 st person. OR Most of paper in need of revision in terms of sentence structure (grammar and mechanics).	8-9 spelling errors	13-19 individual errors OR > 25% of references are newsletters &/or lay magazines &/or questionable web references &/or books (that are not written by author of the theory)	3-4 format components missing or in error. (Minus 7.5 points)
0 Very Substandard or Absent	Sentence structure (mechanics and grammar) so poor it is difficult to read	> 9 spelling errors	> 20 individual errors OR no citations within manuscript. OR no reference page.	> 4 other format components missing or in error. (Minus 10 points)