

Course Project Evaluation Rubric

RM-601: Advanced Research Methods
Fall Semester 2026

Course Information

- Meridian University
- RM-601: Advanced Research Methods
- Dr. Elena Torres
- Fall Semester 2026
- Graduate Level | 3 Credit Hours

Student & Project Details

- Marcus Chen
- **Project:** Neural Correlates of Decision-Making under Uncertainty in Young Adults
- **Submitted:** October 14, 2026
- **Type:** Empirical Research Proposal

Evaluation Guidelines: This rubric assesses seven dimensions of research quality. Each criterion is scored on a 4-point scale: **Exemplary (4)**, **Proficient (3)**, **Developing (2)**, or **Beginning (1)**. Descriptors define the standard for each performance level. Weights reflect the relative importance of each criterion toward the final grade. Provide evidence-based justification for each score in the comments section on the final page.

Detailed Performance Rubric

RM-601 | Research Project Evaluation | Marcus Chen

Performance Level

Criterion	Wt	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Beginning (1)	Score
1. Research Question	15%	Question is original, clearly stated, and identifies a significant gap in the literature. Scope is well-defined, appropriately bounded, and feasible within the proposed timeline and resources.	Question is clearly articulated and relevant to the field. Shows awareness of its significance, though the scope may be slightly too broad or too narrow for the project constraints.	Question is present but lacks precision or originality. Significance is implied rather than explicitly argued with reference to prior work. Scope is loosely defined.	Question is vague, overly broad, or effectively missing. Limited or no meaningful connection to prior literature or practical relevance. Scope is unclear or unworkable.	/4
2. Literature Review	15%	Comprehensive, critical synthesis of relevant and current literature. Theoretical framework is clearly articulated and directly informs and justifies the research design and hypotheses.	Adequate coverage of key literature with some synthesis across sources. Theoretical framework is present and broadly aligned with the research question, though integration could be deeper.	Covers relevant sources but lacks critical synthesis or evaluation. Theoretical framework is mentioned but not well-integrated into the study rationale or design decisions.	Few or demonstrably inappropriate sources cited. No discernible theoretical framework to situate the investigation or guide the analytical approach.	/4
3. Methodology	20%	Design is rigorously justified and optimally suited to the research question. Threats to internal and external validity are comprehensively identified with mitigation strategies. Procedures are fully replicable.	Methodology is appropriate for the question and described with sufficient clarity. Most validity concerns are acknowledged and addressed. Procedures are clear and largely replicable.	Methodology has flaws in justification, appropriateness, or completeness. Key procedural details are missing or ambiguous, limiting replicability and raising validity concerns.	Methodology is fundamentally inappropriate for the research question or so poorly described that evaluation is impossible. Major validity threats are entirely unaddressed.	/4
4. Data Analysis	20%	Analytical techniques are sophisticated, correctly applied, and well-justified given the data and design. Interpretation is nuanced, appropriately cautious, and firmly grounded in the evidence.	Appropriate analytical techniques are selected and correctly applied. Interpretation is logical and well-supported by the data, with most important caveats and limitations noted.	Some analytical choices are questionable, poorly justified, or incorrectly executed. Interpretation occasionally overreaches beyond what the data support or overlooks important patterns.	Analysis is fundamentally flawed, superficial, or absent. Interpretation is unsupported by or disconnected from the data presented. Key analytical steps are missing.	/4

Continued on next page

Criterion	Wt	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Beginning (1)	Score
5. Presentation of Results	10%	Results are presented with exceptional clarity, logical organization, and visual impact. Tables and figures are thoughtfully designed and enhance comprehension. All findings are accurately and completely reported.	Results are clearly presented and well-organized. Visual elements are appropriate, correctly labeled, and effective. Reporting is accurate with only minor omissions or formatting issues.	Presentation has clarity or organizational issues in places. Visual elements may be confusing, redundant, or inadequately labeled. Minor inaccuracies or omissions in reporting.	Results are confusing, misleading, or substantially incomplete. Visual elements are absent, inappropriate, or incorrectly constructed. Significant reporting errors undermine credibility.	/4
6. Critical Discussion	10%	Discussion thoughtfully situates findings within the broader literature. Limitations are critically and honestly examined. Theoretical and practical implications are compelling, specific, and well-articulated.	Findings are connected to relevant literature. Limitations are acknowledged and discussed. Implications for theory and practice are identified, though they may lack specificity or depth.	Connection to the literature is superficial or selective. Limitations are noted but not meaningfully explored. Implications are generic, underdeveloped, or overstated.	Discussion is disconnected from the results or literature. No meaningful reflection on limitations. Implications are absent, trivial, or entirely unsupported by the evidence presented.	/4
7. Writing & Organization	10%	Writing is elegant, concise, and impeccably organized. Follows disciplinary style conventions (APA 7th) flawlessly. Citations and references are complete and correctly formatted throughout.	Writing is clear, coherent, and generally well-organized. Minor stylistic or formatting errors that do not impede comprehension. Most citations and references are correct.	Writing has noticeable issues in clarity, flow, or logical organization. Citation and formatting errors are present and distracting to the reader.	Writing quality significantly impedes understanding. Organization is poor or absent. Citations are missing, inconsistent, or incorrectly formatted throughout the document.	/4

Scoring Summary & Final Evaluation

#	Criterion	Weight	Raw Score	Weighted Score	Comments
1	Research Question & Significance	15%	/4		
2	Literature Review & Framework	15%	/4		
3	Methodology & Research Design	20%	/4		
4	Data Analysis & Interpretation	20%	/4		
5	Presentation of Results	10%	/4		
6	Critical Discussion & Reflection	10%	/4		
7	Writing Quality & Organization	10%	/4		
Total		100%		/100	

Grade Scale

A	93–100	4.0
A–	90–92	3.7
B+	87–89	3.3
B	83–86	3.0
B–	80–82	2.7
C+	77–79	2.3
C	70–76	2.0
D	60–69	1.0
F	0–59	0.0

/ 100

Letter Grade:

GPA Equivalent:

Date:

Instructor Comments

Dr. Elena Torres

Associate Professor, Department of Research Methods

Meridian University

Date: