**Rubric for Evaluation of HAABB Scholarship Paper**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Exemplary = 3 points** | **Good = 2 points** | **Acceptable = 1 point** | **Unacceptable = 0** | |
| ***Content***  **Total Points \_\_\_\_\_\_** | Balanced presentation of  relevant and legitimate  information that clearly  supports a central purpose or argument ***and*** shows a  thoughtful, in-depth analysis of a **transfusion medicine** topic. Reader gains important insights. | Information provides reasonable support for a central purpose or  argument and displays evidence of a basic analysis of a **transfusion medicine** topic. Reader gains some insights. | Information supports a central purpose or argument at times.  Topic or analysis is basic or general.  Reader gains few insights. | Central purpose or argument is not clearly identified.  Analysis is vague or not  evident. Reader is confused or may be misinformed. | |
| ***Organization***  **Total Points \_\_\_\_\_\_** | The ideas are arranged logically to support the purpose or argument.  They flow smoothly  from one to another and are clearly linked to each  other. The reader easily follows the line of reasoning. | The ideas are arranged logically to support the central purpose or  argument. They are usually  clearly linked to each other. For the most part, the reader can follow the line of reasoning. | In general, the writing is  arranged logically, although occasionally  ideas fail to make sense  together. The reader is  fairly clear about what writer intends. | The writing is not logically  organized. Frequently, ideas fail to make sense together.  The reader cannot identify a line of reasoning and loses interest. | |
| ***Style***  **Total Points \_\_\_\_\_\_** |  | The writing is compelling. It hooks the reader and  sustains interest throughout. | The writing is generally engaging, but has some dry  spots. In general, it is focused and keeps the reader's attention. | The writing is unengaging. Though the paper has some interesting parts, the reader finds it difficult to  maintain interest. | |
| ***Sentence Structure***  **Total Points \_\_\_\_\_\_** |  | Sentences are well-phrased and varied in length and  structure. They flow smoothly from one to another. | Sentences are well-phrased and there is some variety in length and structure. The sentence flow is generally smooth. | Some sentences are awkwardly constructed so that the reader is distracted. | |
| ***Grammar, Spelling, Writing Mechanics (punctuation, capitalization)***  **Total Points \_\_\_\_\_\_** |  | The writing is free or almost free of errors. | There are occasional errors, but they don’t  represent a major  distraction. | The writing has many errors, and the reader is  distracted by them. | |
| **Criteria** | **Exemplary = 3 points** | **Good = 2 points** | **Acceptable = 1 point** | **Unacceptable = 0** |
| ***Length (2-5 pages)***  **Total Points \_\_\_\_\_\_** |  |  | Paper is the number of pages specified in the  assignment. | Paper has fewer pages (or in dramatic excess) than specified in the assignment. |
| ***Use of References***  **Total Points \_\_\_\_\_\_** | Compelling evidence from  professionally legitimate  sources is given to support  claims. Attribution is clear and fairly represented. | Professionally legitimate sources that support  claims are generally  present and attribution is, for the most part, clear and fairly represented. | Although attributions are  occasionally given, many  statements seem unsubstantiated.  The reader is confused about the source of  information and ideas. | References are seldom cited to support statements. |
| ***Quality of References***  **Total Points \_\_\_\_\_\_** | References are primarily peer reviewed professional journals  or other approved sources (e.g., **current** blood bank textbooks, AABB articles, *Technical Manual*, *Standards*, etc.)  The reader is  confident that the information  and ideas can be trusted. | Although most of the references are professionally legitimate, a few are questionable  (e.g., trade books,  internet sources such as Wikipedia, popular  magazines, …). The  reader is uncertain of the  reliability of some of the sources. | Most of the references are from sources that are not  peer reviewed and have uncertain reliability. The reader doubts the accuracy  of much of the material presented. | There are virtually no sources  that are professionally reliable.  The reader seriously doubts  the value of the material. |
| ***Citation***  **Total Points \_\_\_\_\_\_** |  |  | Cites all data obtained from other sources using a **consistent** format. Utilizes APA, MLA or AMA citation style in both text and bibliography. | Cites some data obtained from other sources. Citation style is either inconsistent or incorrect. |
| **Total points**  **from 9 criteria \_\_\_\_\_\_** |  |  |  |  |