## **ECO 407 – Critical Reviews Grading Rubric**

Category	Excellent	Good	Competent	Problematic	Pts.
Introduction	<ul> <li>[4-5]</li> <li>Grabs readers' attention.</li> <li>Sets up thesis statement.</li> <li>Gives accurate and concise representation of authors' main arguments.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>[3-4]</li> <li>Thesis statement hard to identify.</li> <li>Gives accurate and concise representation of authors' main arguments.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>[2-3]</li> <li>No thesis statement.</li> <li>Gives mostly accurate representation of authors' main arguments.</li> <li>Includes some authors' arguments that are not addressed in the analysis.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>[0-2]</li> <li>Inaccurate representation of authors' main arguments.</li> <li>Too long and includes many authors' arguments not addressed in the analysis.</li> </ul>	[5]
Critical Economic Analysis	<ul> <li>[25-30]</li> <li>Critically analyzes authors' arguments using an economic framework.</li> <li>Pays attention to details of model, assumptions, predictions, etc.</li> <li>Correctly and effectively uses tools studied in class (or in other courses).</li> <li>Criticisms pick out important economic points and not minor aspects.</li> <li>Shows independent thinking rather than merely paraphrasing class or other materials.</li> <li>Uses evidence to refute/support arguments.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>[20-25]</li> <li>Critically analyzes authors' arguments using an economic framework.</li> <li>Mostly pays attention to details of model, assumptions, predictions, etc.</li> <li>Correctly and effectively uses tools studied in class (or in other courses) with only minor errors.</li> <li>Focuses critical analysis on minor points such as writing style, minor inconsistencies or quality of authors' sources.</li> <li>Mostly paraphrases class or other materials with no evidence of independent thinking.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>[15-20]</li> <li>Attempts to translate the authors' arguments into an economic framework that uses tools studied in class (or in other courses).</li> <li>Uses class or other tools with significant conceptual errors.</li> <li>Does not show clearly that has identified and understood authors' arguments.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>[0-15]</li> <li>Mostly summarizes articles.</li> <li>Makes minimal to no attempt to link articles' arguments to class tools.</li> <li>Uses class or other tools with significant conceptual errors.</li> </ul>	[30]

Exposition	<ul> <li>[8-10]</li> <li>Paragraphs well organized by thought.</li> <li>Smooth transition between paragraphs.</li> <li>Clear, easy to read sentences.</li> <li>No unnecessary repetitions.</li> <li>Economic terms and concepts clearly explained.</li> <li>Sources are referenced and cited correctly.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>[7-8]</li> <li>Paragraphs not always well organized by thoughts.</li> <li>Mostly smooth transition between paragraphs.</li> <li>Some long, confused sentences.</li> <li>Some minor unnecessary repetition.</li> <li>Some economic terms and concepts used without clear explanation.</li> <li>Sources are referenced and cited correctly.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>[5-7]</li> <li>Paragraphs organization needs work.</li> <li>Some sentence/word problems making it difficult to understand reasoning.</li> <li>Economic terms used frequently without attempt to explain them.</li> <li>Sources are mostly referenced and cited correctly.</li> <li>Lengthy quotations from article instead of a concise summary if needed.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>[0-5]</li> <li>Significant sentence/word problems making it difficult to understand reasoning.</li> <li>Not completely written in paragraphs (e.g., bullet points, equations, graphs).</li> <li>Sources are referenced and cited incorrectly.</li> </ul>	[10]
Conclusion	[4-5] • Summarizes the analysis <i>briefly</i> and <i>accurately</i> .	[3-4] • Attempts to summarize the analysis briefly and accurately.	[2-3] • Summarizes the analysis somehow accurately but not briefly.	<ul><li>[0-2]</li><li>No proper conclusion (summary not attempted).</li></ul>	[5]