

# Research Paper

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Memo: \_\_\_\_\_

5	100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Information Seeking/Selecting and Evaluating</b>—Student gathered information from at least <b>THREE</b> different <b>high quality</b> sources cited in the MLA format.</li> <li>• <b>The Content</b> — Topic developed with well-chosen, relevant, concrete details. <b>Approach is more analytical than descriptive.</b> Established and maintained a formal style and objective tone</li> <li>• <b>The Writing</b> — Used varied transitions and sentence structures to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships among ideas and concepts. Uses precise language and domain-specific vocabulary. Few errors in English conventions.</li> <li>• <b>Product</b>— Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization. The paper is <b>typed</b> and well-presented.</li> </ul>
	94	
4	85	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three different sources are cited in the MLA format. May be weakness in sources.</li> <li>• Topic developed with well-chosen, relevant, concrete details. <b>Approach is still more analytical than descriptive.</b> May be minor weakness in style and tone.</li> <li>• May have minor weakness in transitions or cohesion. Needs more precise language and domain-specific vocabulary. Few errors in English conventions.</li> <li>• Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization. The paper is <b>typed</b> and well-presented.</li> </ul>
	78	
3	71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three different sources are cited in the MLA format. May be weakness in sources. May have minor errors in MLA format.</li> <li>• Topic is under-developed with limited relevant, concrete details. <b>Approach is more descriptive than analytical.</b> May be weakness in style and tone. <b><u>At this level, the student is only reporting out on information s/he looked up and gives little or no original thought.</u></b></li> <li>• Usually serious weakness in transitions or cohesion at this level. Serious deficit in precise language and domain-specific vocabulary. May have errors in English conventions.</li> <li>• Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization. The paper is <b>typed, though there may be minor problems with presentation and format.</b></li> </ul>
	65	
2	58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited source material, possibly fewer than three or serious reliability issues. MLA format is attempted, but contains errors.</li> <li>• Topic is under-developed with very limited relevant, concrete details. <b>Approach is more descriptive than analytical.</b> Weakness in writing style and tone.</li> <li>• Serious weakness in transitions or cohesion at this level. Serious deficit in precise language and domain-specific vocabulary. May have serious or frequent errors in English conventions.</li> <li>• Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization. The paper may not be typed or there may be serious problems with presentation.</li> </ul>

## INFORMATION

- There is no credit for tasks scoring below level 2. The rubric is on a five-point scale to parallel the NYS essay rubrics.
- Common Core State Standards for Writing 6-12 #7 and #8 and Information Writing grades 9-10 standard #2.

## Rubric Information for Task: Research Paper

This rubric was aligned to Global History and Geography Regents Exam using standardized z-score equivalency procedure.

### NOTES:

- Both distributions are normal (fit empirical rule)
- Individual scores on this rubric can be transformed as state exam equivalent scores using the standardized z-score equivalency procedure

### APPENDIX

N = **19** scores

$$z = (i - \bar{x})/s$$

$$\text{This Rubric } \bar{x} = 80.32 \\ S = 16.81$$

$$\text{State Test } \bar{x} = 82.6 \\ S = 11.71$$

<b>State Exam Score</b>	<b>Standard Score</b>	<b>This Task Equivalent Score</b>
65	-1.50	63
71	-0.99	69
78	-0.39	76
100	1.49	98

State test scores were 30 scores randomly chosen from 87 scores of 3 examinations over 3 years.