eosc212 - Rubric for marking abstracts

Based on the popular model for a paper's <u>structure</u> (as opposed to the outline of components needed in a scientific article):

1. Introduction: Context and motivation
2. Introduction: Research Question / thesis
3. Methods: Data
4. Methods: Analysis
5. Results
6. Discussion (might include implications, future research directions, caveats, etc.)

Category	Expert (5)	Proficient (4)	Competent (3)	Novice (2)	Inadequate (1)	Missing (0)
Introduction components 20%	All four components, and clearly summarized.	Between Expert and Competent.	Three out of four, or but perhaps a bit confusing.	Two out of the four, or very confusing	Hints only.	None
Methods components 25%	All there and clearly summarized.	Between Expert and Competent.	Both mentioned but possibly not very clear	Only one of data or analysis, or very confusing	Hints only.	None
Results & Discussion 30%	All there and clearly summarized.	Between Expert and Competent.	Both mentioned but possibly not very clear.	One or the other only, or very confusing.	Hints only.	none
Succinct and well written 25%	Correct length AND very clear, tight and mature writing.	Between Expert and Competent.	Roughly correct length, but not clear or concise, and/or writing style needs work.	Somewhat too long or short; clearly not proof read, or rather badly finished.	Long & rambling, much too short, or hard to figure out	n.a.

NOTE: This has been translated into a CONNECT system "rubric" to make marking abstracts a bit easier.