

Name: _____

Grading Guidelines:

Following the assignment guidelines, your score is based on total possible points per feature of your summary. For specific suggestions and comments, please see comments within summary.

Content Review (30 points)

Article background and research goal.

10	Excellent	8	7	Good	5	4	Needs Improvement	2
Background information and goal of the research are concisely summarized. Author does not “dumb down” the background information.			Background information and goal of the research are somewhat broad/wordy or not entirely summarized. Author somewhat “dumbs down” the background information.			Background information and goal of the research are too broad/wordy and incompletely summarized. Author clearly “dumbs down” the background information.		

Research Method(s).

10	Excellent	8	7	Good	5	4	Needs Improvement	2
The main research method(s) is concisely summarized, without unnecessary technical details. Presentation of the methods aids reader in understanding research approach.			Main research method(s) is somewhat concisely summarized, and/or unnecessary technical details are included. Presentation of the methods somewhat aids in reader understanding research approach.			Main research method(s) is poorly summarized, or not summarized at all. Alternatively, technical details comprise the majority of the summary. Presentation of the method (or lack thereof) confuses reader.		

Results and conclusion of article.

10	Excellent	8	7	Good	5	4	Needs Improvement	2
Key findings and interpretation of the findings are clearly summarized. Reader easily understands what was discovered in via the research project.			Some key findings and/or interpretations are summarized. Reader understands what was discovered, although not easily.			Few if any key findings are summarized. Interpretation of findings not clearly summarized. Reader is left confused about what discoveries were made.		

Figure(s) (15 points)

Do your images support reader understanding of article goal/discovery?

5	Excellent	4	Good	3	2	Needs Improvement	1
Three images are provided: one is a cartoon/diagram (created by the author) to aid overall understanding, the second is a figure of the proposed RNA structure and the third is a graph of the luciferase data.		1-2 images are provided.		One or no image is provided.			
Presentation choices enhance reader comprehension of the question/hypothesis tested during the project.		Figure presentation confuses reader comprehension of the research conducted in the article.		Presentation choice (or lack of) makes understanding the research conducted in the article difficult/impossible.			

Is your figure appropriately labeled, titled and annotated?

5 Excellent	4 Good	3	2 Needs Improvement	1
Appropriate titles, legends/captions and annotations are included and enhance understanding.	Titles, legends/captions and annotations are unspecific or difficult to follow.		Titles, legends/captions, and/or annotations are missing.	

Relevance (10 points)

Is the “so what” factor clearly stated, in simple language?

5 Excellent	4 Good	3	2 Needs Improvement	1
Describes why the study is important in the context of known literature, naturally leads the reader to the “so what” factor of the project.	Context is only partly described, link between context and the “so what” factor is unclear or confusing.		Does not describe why the study is important in the context of known literature; does not lead the reader to the “so what” factor.	
5 Excellent	4 Good	3	2 Needs Improvement	1
Uses plain, simple language when describing the relevance.	Language is mostly simple when describing the relevance.		Relevance is written in complex language, making it difficult to understand.	

Use of Plain Language (20 points)

Use of scientific jargon.

10 Excellent	8	7 Good	5	4 Needs Improvement	2
Language is kept simple throughout the summary. If jargon is used, it is clearly defined/described.	Language is mostly simple and plain. Some jargon is used, however it is not clearly defined/described.		Language is largely complex. Undefined jargon is used frequently.		

Figures of speech.

10 Excellent	8	7 Good	5	4 Needs Improvement	2
Where appropriate, analogies, metaphors, and/or similes are used to describe scientific concepts. Figures of speech are useful and aid in reader comprehension.	Where appropriate, analogies, metaphors, and/or similes are used to describe scientific concepts. Figures of speech are mostly useful and aid in reader comprehension.		Analogies, metaphors, and/or similes are not used, even when there are clear instances where these would be useful.		

Organization (10 points)

Is the overall summary organized in a logical manner?

5 Excellent	4 Good	3	2 Needs Improvement	1
Ideas and or key findings clearly build off of each other throughout the summary.	Ideas/findings mostly flow, however a few ideas are presented out of order, forcing the reader to piece topics together.		Ideas are scattered. Reader is left confused.	

Clear introduction and conclusions.

5 Excellent	4 Good	3	2 Needs Improvement	1
Broad introduction and conclusion help to tie the summary together.	Either introduction or conclusion are missing or are not obvious.		Clearly missing introduction and conclusion.	

Grammar & Writing Mechanics (15 points)

Written in active voice, third person?

5 Excellent	4 Good 3	2 Needs Improvement 1
Summary is consistently written in the active voice and third person.	Summary is mostly written in the active voice and mostly third person.	Summary is not written in the active voice and/or third person.

Abbreviations and nominalizations.

5 Excellent	4 Good 3	2 Needs Improvement 1
Abbreviations and nominalizations are avoided. If abbreviations are used, they are clearly defined.	Abbreviations and nominalizations are mostly avoided. Most used abbreviations are defined.	Abbreviations and/or nominalizations are used frequently.

Writing Mechanics

5 Excellent	4 Good 3	2 Needs Improvement 1
Grammar, punctuation, word usage, and spelling enhance paper quality.	A few mechanical errors, but does not distract the reader too greatly.	Many mechanical errors severely detract from meaning of paper.

Total Score:

Comments: