

## Grading Rubric for NAME

	<b>Inadequate (1)</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory (2)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (3)</b>	<b>Outstanding (4)</b>
<p><b>General Formatting</b> (IYNA will handle this part)</p> <p>___ / 3</p>	<p>Formatting requirements are not met, and prompt is insufficiently addressed.</p>	<p>Formatting requirements met, but prompt is insufficiently addressed.</p>	<p>All requirements met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Title page is provided with name, school, and email.</li> <li>2) Project has a title</li> <li>3) Works cited is included</li> <li>4) Proposal is between 1000 to 1750 words and the works cited will not count to this word limit</li> <li>5) Text is 12pt times new roman using double spacing.</li> </ol>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p>___ / 4</p>	<p>Abstract is either completely absent or fails to summarize both the objective and the scope of the research proposal</p>	<p>Abstract summarizes either the objective or scope of the proposal, but not both</p>	<p>Abstract summarizes both the objective and scope of the research proposal, but abstract may have issues with clarity of communication</p>	<p>Abstract summarizes both the objective and scope of the research proposal in a clear and well-organized way</p>
<p><b>Methodology</b></p> <p>___ / 4</p>	<p>Author provides little to no information about the methodology, timescale, or ethical considerations. Methods that are discussed are not feasible and poorly researched.</p>	<p>Author engages in discussion of methodology, but said discussion is unrealistic and demonstrates a lack of thorough planning, research, and understanding. Connection to research aims is unclear.</p>	<p>Author discusses methodology in detail and shows connections to research aims, though they might not be perfectly clear or direct. Author cites relevant sources and demonstrates few misconceptions about the experiments being proposed and the results they will give rise to.</p>	<p>Author demonstrates a deep understanding of experimental design in methodology. The connection between research aims and methods presented is logical and clear. Author cites relevant sources for methodology and carefully considers potential issues that may arise. Ethical considerations are carefully</p>

				considered, and a realistic timeline is presented.
<b>Scientific Understanding</b>  ____ / 4	Author demonstrates a total lack of understanding of the subject matter. Methodology is poorly researched and demonstrates a lack of understanding of the field.	Author demonstrates incomplete understanding, making the proposal unlikely to be carried out as planned. Inaccurate or incomplete information is presented in the introduction.	Author demonstrates some level of research and knowledge of the topic, but small errors and misunderstandings remain making minimal aspects of the proposal unrealistic to implement.	Author demonstrates exemplary knowledge of subject. Methodology is evidently well researched, and introduction does a comprehensively summarizes relevant information in the field.
<b>Innovation and creativity</b>  ____ / 4	Author does not demonstrate any creativity, innovation, or use of original content; proposal is something that already has a clear answer and lacks a creative approach.	Author includes original content but lacks a creative approach.	Author includes original content and a creative and innovative approach to solve the problem at hand.	Author does an exemplary job of presenting content in a way that is creative, innovative, and original. Creator goes above and beyond to take a unique and untraditional approach to the question, and methods are used in innovative ways.
<b>Feasibility</b>  ____ / 4	Proposal is infeasible. Experiments do not work as proposed in the write up.	Proposal would be feasible with an infinite amount of time and resources but cannot realistically be implemented.	Proposal is feasible with a good amount of time, resources, and minimal revisions.	Proposal is feasible within a reasonable time frame and would not need to be revised to complete.
Comments:				