

Components	Outcome Quality Levels		
	Excellent	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Statement of the Problem	Clearly written. Presents interesting questions and provides a thoughtful statement of the problem and its broad significance.	Provides a general discussion of the question or issues, but does not satisfactorily discuss their broader significance.	Shows a fundamental lack of understanding of the problem. Poorly written, incomplete, lacks structure.
Check one:			
Literature and Previous Work	Places the work within a larger context. Appropriately integrates relevant material. Builds a strong case for the research.	Cites most of the key literature. Lacks sufficient critical analysis and synthesis.	Fails to cite or misinterprets important, relevant literature. Does not clearly relate the literature to the student's contribution.
Check one:			
Methodology/Approach	Uses original methodology or existing methodology in creative ways. Design of study shows comprehensive grasp of methods used.	Demonstrates competent use of existing methods. Design of study allows an adequate test of the hypotheses.	Uses the wrong methodology or uses the methodology incorrectly. Data are not handled appropriately.
Check one:			
Results/Analysis (For QPs and potentially for pilot data in the proposal)	Robust, meaningful, interesting results obtained from innovative data analyses (where relevant). Provides insightful arguments for or against the hypotheses.	Analyses are executed correctly, but additional or alternative analyses may have yielded further insights.	Misanalyzes data or fails to analyze relevant data. Results do not follow from the analysis and mistakes are made in interpretation.
Check one:			
Discussion/Conclusion	Places the study in a larger theoretical context. Identifies the significance and limitations of the research. Informs our understanding of the nature of language.	Summarizes and repeats what was found. Does not adequately discuss the contributions or limitations of the research.	Insufficient or incoherent discussion of results. Shows lack of understanding of linguistic theories.
Check one:			
Originality and Substance (For QPs only)	Proposal has the originality and substance that make it publishable in a professionally advantageous way (e.g. in a top-tier or a strong second-tier journal)	Proposal is solid and interesting, but lacks the originality or caliber needed for a strong publication.	Proposal is weak or vague.
Check one:			
Quality of Written (a) and Oral (b) Communication	Communicates research clearly and professionally. Demonstrates a command of scientific style (in written and oral presentations).	The writing and/or presentation are serviceable, but some aspects of the work are not explained clearly or coherently.	Poorly written and/or presented; cannot convey the basic nature of the research.
Check one:	(a) (b)	(a) (b)	(a) (b)

Written Comments (Optional)

Statement of the Problem _____

Literature and Previous Work _____

Methodology/Approach _____

Results/Analysis _____

Discussion/Conclusion _____

Originality and Substance _____

Quality of Written (a) and Oral (b) Communication _____
