

	Meets or Exceeds Expectations	Mostly Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Research Problem/Purpose	25.2 (9.00%) - 28 (10.00%) Research problem, purpose of research, and relevance to nursing are clearly identified.	21.28 (7.60%) - 24.92 (8.90%) Research problem, purpose of research, and relevance to nursing are somewhat identified.	16.8 (6.00%) - 21 (7.50%) Research problem, purpose of research, and relevance to nursing are mostly absent or misidentified.	0 (0.00%) - 16.52 (5.90%) Research problem, purpose of research, and relevance to nursing are absent.
Review of the Literature	37.8 (13.50%) - 42 (15.00%) Concepts explored in the literature review are clearly identified. Critique of the references is included and well developed.	31.92 (11.40%) - 37.38 (13.35%) Concepts explored in the literature review are somewhat identified. Critique of the references is included, but may not be fully developed.	25.2 (9.00%) - 31.5 (11.25%) Concepts explored in the literature review are misidentified. Critique of the references is severely lacking.	0 (0.00%) - 24.78 (8.85%) Concepts explored in the literature review are absent. Critique of the references is absent.
Theoretical Framework	25.2 (9.00%) - 28 (10.00%) A theoretical concept/framework is identified and well analyzed for appropriateness. If the article lacks a concept/framework, a suitable one is suggested.	21.28 (7.60%) - 24.92 (8.90%) A theoretical concept/framework is somewhat identified and analyzed for appropriateness. If the article lacks a concept/framework, a potential concept/framework is suggested, but it is somewhat inappropriate.	16.8 (6.00%) - 21 (7.50%) A theoretical concept/framework is somewhat identified and analyzed for appropriateness. If the article lacks a concept/framework, a potential concept/framework is suggested, is not identified or is grossly inappropriate.	0 (0.00%) - 16.52 (5.90%) A theoretical concept/framework is misidentified or not analyzed for appropriateness.
Variables, Hypotheses, Questions, and Assumptions	12.6 (4.50%) - 14 (5.00%) IV and DV are identified and defined. Discussion on measurability is included. Research question and hypothesis are identified.	10.64 (3.80%) - 12.46 (4.45%) IV and DV are somewhat identified and or partially defined. Discussion on measurability is somewhat included. Research question and hypothesis are partially identified.	8.4 (3.00%) - 10.5 (3.75%) IV and DV identification and definition are absent or severely lacking. Discussion on measurability is absent or inaccurate. Research question and hypothesis are not identified or grossly misidentified.	0 (0.00%) - 8.26 (2.95%) IV and DV identification and definition are absent. Discussion on measurability is absent. Research question and hypothesis are not identified.
Methodology	50.4 (18.00%) - 56 (20.00%) Type of design, sample size, study population, sampling method, and type of reasoning are properly identified. Reliability and validity of measurement tools, ethical considerations, and probability vs. non-probability sampling are discussed.	42.56 (15.20%) - 49.84 (17.80%) Type of design, sample size, study population, sampling method, and type of reasoning are somewhat identified. Reliability and validity of measurement tools, ethical considerations, and probability vs. non-probability sampling are discussed, but some information is inaccurate.	33.6 (12.00%) - 42 (15.00%) Type of design, sample size, study population, sampling method, and type of reasoning are absent or misidentified. Reliability and validity of measurement tools, ethical considerations, and probability vs. non-probability sampling are either absent or grossly inaccurate.	0 (0.00%) - 33.04 (11.80%) Type of design, sample size, study population, sampling method, and type of reasoning are absent. Reliability and validity of measurement tools, ethical considerations, and probability vs. non-probability sampling are absent.

Data Analysis	37.8 (13.50%) - 42 (15.00%) Data analysis tool is identified. An explanation on how the results are presented in the study is included and accurate. At least one finding is appropriately identified.	31.92 (11.40%) - 37.38 (13.35%) Data analysis tool is somewhat identified. An incomplete explanation on how the results are presented in the study is included. At least one finding is identified.	25.2 (9.00%) - 31.5 (11.25%) Data analysis tool is absent or misidentified. An explanation on how the results are presented in the study is absent or grossly unclear. Findings are not included or are grossly inaccurate.	0 (0.00%) - 24.78 (8.85%) Data analysis tool is absent. An explanation on how the results are presented in the study is absent. Findings are not included.
Summary, Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations	50.4 (18.00%) - 56 (20.00%) Strengths and limitations of the study are identified. A discussion on whether or not the study can be generalized is included. An evaluation of the findings, conclusions, and significance to nursing is included and appropriate.	42.56 (15.20%) - 49.84 (17.80%) Strengths and limitations of the study are somewhat identified. A discussion on whether or not the study can be generalized is included but may not be fully developed. An evaluation of the findings, conclusions, and significance to nursing may not be fully developed.	33.6 (12.00%) - 42 (15.00%) Strengths and limitations of study are absent or lacking. A discussion on whether or not the study can be generalized is absent or lacking. An evaluation of the findings, conclusions, and significance to nursing is absent or inappropriate.	0 (0.00%) - 33.04 (11.80%) Strengths and limitations of study are absent. A discussion on whether or not the study can be generalized is absent. An evaluation of the findings, conclusions, and significance to nursing is absent.
Mechanics and APA Format	12.6 (4.50%) - 14 (5.00%) Written in a clear, concise, formal, and organized manner. Responses are mostly error free. Information from sources is appropriately paraphrased and accurately cited.	10.64 (3.80%) - 12.46 (4.45%) Writing is generally clear and organized but is not concise or formal in language. Multiple errors exist in spelling and grammar with minor interference with readability or comprehension. Most information from sources is correctly paraphrased and cited.	8.4 (3.00%) - 10.5 (3.75%) Writing is generally unclear and unorganized. Some errors in spelling and grammar detract from readability and comprehension. Sources are missing or improperly cited.	0 (0.00%) - 8.26 (2.95%) Writing is unclear and unorganized. Errors in spelling and grammar detract from readability and comprehension. Sources are missing.