

## Chem 002 “Rubric” (Scoring Guide): Paper - Clarity

<i>Criteria to be assessed</i>	<b>Exemplary, beyond expectations</b>	<b>Acceptable, accomplishes task</b>	<b>Partial Success, revision needed</b>	<b>Engaged Task w Little Success, Needs Work</b>
<b>Format &amp; Neatness:</b>       <b>out of 8 pts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Followed expected format, included title page, all sections were clearly evident.</li> <li>•Paper is neat and legible. Font is easy to read.</li> <li>•Page numbers with last name are included.</li> <li>•Paragraphs are concise and double spaced.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>8 pts</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Followed expected format, included title page and all sections, though sections may not be clearly evident.</li> <li>•Paper is generally neat and legible. Font is easy to read.</li> <li>•Page numbers with last name are included.</li> <li>•Paragraphs are generally concise and double spaced.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>7.5 pts</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Did not follow expected format, but format was evident. Title page was not included.</li> <li>•Paper is somewhat neat and legible. Font may be difficult to read.</li> <li>•Page numbers are included, though name may not be included.</li> <li>•Paragraphs are extended beyond one thought and/or not double spaced.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>6.5 pts</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•No identifiable format.</li> <li>•Paper is difficult to read due to neatness or illegibility. Font may be difficult to read.</li> <li>•Page numbers are not included.</li> <li>•Paragraphs are extended beyond one thought and not double spaced.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>0-5 pts</b></p>
<b>Logical Presentation (Organization &amp; Coherence):</b>       <b>out of 9pts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Clearly stated thesis/ main idea.</li> <li>•Shows careful reading of sources and evaluates them.</li> <li>•Provides detailed analysis beyond a summary of the paper.</li> <li>•Defines terms accurately.</li> <li>•Clear organization of ideas that follows a natural flow of ideas.</li> <li>•Uses varied and sophisticated transitional devices.</li> <li>•Each paragraph is clearly related to the paper’s central idea and guides the reader through the progression of ideas.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>9pts</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Clearly stated thesis/ main idea, may have minor lapses in development.</li> <li>•Shows careful reading of sources, but may not evaluate them.</li> <li>•Provides insight beyond a summary of the paper.</li> <li>•Attempts to define terms, not always successfully.</li> <li>•Clear organization of ideas (e.g., may move from least important to most important idea).</li> <li>•Uses fairly sophisticated transitional devices.</li> <li>•Each paragraph clearly related to the paper’s central idea.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>8pts</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Presents central idea in general terms.</li> <li>•Shows basic comprehension of sources, perhaps with lapses in understanding.</li> <li>•Provides a limited summary of the paper without any analysis.</li> <li>•Does not define all terms, or uses nontechnical definitions.</li> <li>•Organization of ideas seems random or illogical.</li> <li>•Uses transitions, but they seem to be sequential as opposed to logical.</li> <li>•Paragraphs may not all relate to the paper’s central idea.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>6.5pts</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Does not have a clear central idea and/or does not respond appropriately to the assignment.</li> <li>•Shows limited or no understanding of sources.</li> <li>•Does not provide a summary or any type of analysis of the paper.</li> <li>•Does not define terms, or uses incorrect definitions.</li> <li>•Organization of ideas seems completely random or illogical.</li> <li>•Uses few or inappropriate transitions.</li> <li>•Paragraphs do not seem to relate to the paper’s central idea at all.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>0-5 pts</b></p>
<b>Style (Ease of Reading):</b>       <b>out of 9pts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Sentence style is appropriate for purpose of paper and audience.</li> <li>•Chooses words for their precise meaning and uses an appropriate level of specificity.</li> <li>•Sentences are varied yet clearly structured.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>9pts</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Sentence style is appropriate for purpose of paper and audience.</li> <li>•Generally uses words accurately, but may sometimes be too general.</li> <li>•Sentences generally well structured and focused, though some may be awkward.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>8pts</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Sentence style is generally appropriate for the purpose of the paper and audience, but may lapse into an informal style.</li> <li>•Uses relatively vague or general words, may use some terms inappropriately.</li> <li>•Sentence structure generally correct, but sentences may be wordy, unfocused, repetitive or confusing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>6.5pts</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Sentence style is too informal for purpose of paper and audience.</li> <li>•May be too vague and abstract or misuses words.</li> <li>•Sentence structure generally correct, but sentences may be wordy, unfocused, repetitive or confusing.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>0-5 pts</b></p>
<b>Mechanics (Spelling, Grammar &amp; Punctuation):</b>       <b>out of 9pts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Almost entirely free of spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors, the understanding of the reader is not impeded.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>9pts</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•May contain a few grammar errors, which may annoy the reader but do not impede understanding.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>8pts</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Contains several mechanical errors, which may temporarily confuse the reader but do not impede the overall understanding.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>6.5pts</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Contains so many mechanical errors that the reader is unable to follow the connections between one sentence and the next.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>0-5 pts</b></p>
-> Descriptors for each level of performance <-				

**Content Points:** \_\_\_\_\_ **out of 35 points**

**Clarity Points:** \_\_\_\_\_ **out of 65 points**

**Total Points:** \_\_\_\_\_ **out of 100 points**

**Late?** \_\_\_\_\_ **(-4 points per day not to exceed 20points)**

**Overall Score:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Student’s Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Section #:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Initials of TA:** \_\_\_\_\_

## Chem 002 “Rubric” (Scoring Guide): Paper - Content

<i>Criteria to be assessed by performance</i>	<b>Exemplary, beyond expectations</b>	<b>Acceptable, accomplishes task</b>	<b>Partial Success, revision needed</b>	<b>Engaged Task w Little Success, Needs Work</b>
<b>Title Page:</b>  <b>out of 5pts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Title is descriptive and unique.</li> <li>•Title page includes TA’s full name, the correct section number and the date.</li> <li>•Title page is a separate cover page and the format is visually appealing. <b>5pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Title is unique.</li> <li>•Title page includes some form of TA’s name, the section number and the date.</li> <li>•Title page is a separate cover page and in an acceptable format. <b>4.5pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Title is quite similar to the original article. (Summary of “x”).</li> <li>•Title page includes some form of TA’s name or the section number and the date.</li> <li>•Title page is not a separate cover page. <b>3.5pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Title is generic (the name of the paper) or nonexistent.</li> <li>•Title page is missing TA’s name, section number, or date.</li> <li>•Title page is not included at all. <b>0-3 pts</b></li> </ul>
<b>Introduction:</b>  <b>out of 10pts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Includes title of article reviewed and names of both experimenters.</li> <li>•Includes detailed information about the classification of amber (i.e., the classes including the chemical makeup).</li> <li>•Includes detailed information about the different types of plants that produce resins/ambers.</li> <li>•Gives very detailed overview of experiment.</li> <li>•Explains why the experiment is innovative and its impact on science. <b>10pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Includes title of article reviewed and name of at least one experimenter. (e.g., Bray &amp; Anderson.)</li> <li>•Includes information about classification of amber (i.e., Class 1c vs. other classes).</li> <li>•Includes information about the different types of plants that produce resins/ambers.</li> <li>•Gives detailed overview of experiment (e.g., pyrolysis-GCMS and copyrolysis).</li> <li>•Explains why the experiment is innovative. <b>9pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Includes title of article reviewed or names of experimenters.</li> <li>•Includes a limited amount of information about classification system.</li> <li>• Includes a limited amount of information about the types of plants that produce resins/ambers.</li> <li>•Gives a limited overview of experiment.</li> <li>•Tells that the experiment is innovative, but does not explain. <b>7.5pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Does not include title or names of experimenters.</li> <li>•Includes only a mention of the classification system.</li> <li>• Includes only a mention of the fact that resins/ambers are produced by plants.</li> <li>•Gives a vague overview of experiment.</li> <li>•Does not mention that the experiment was innovative. <b>0-7pts</b></li> </ul>
<b>Experimental:</b>  <b>out of 15pts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Gives a compare / contrast of both experimental methods with each other or with NMR or IR techniques.</li> <li>•Discusses in detail the control measures taken.</li> <li>•Discusses in detail the different measures taken to monitor the experiments. <b>15pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Gives a detailed description of experimental methods (i.e., pyrolysis-GCMS and copyrolysis).</li> <li>•Discusses the control measures taken.</li> <li>•Discusses how the experiment was monitored. <b>13.5pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Gives an overview of either experimental method described in the article.</li> <li>•Mentions that control measures were taken.</li> <li>•Mentions that the experiment was monitored. <b>11.5pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Gives a vague overview of the experimental methods with no real understanding of the material.</li> <li>•Does not mention the control measures that were taken.</li> <li>•Does not mention that the experiment was monitored. <b>0-9pts</b></li> </ul>
<b>Results &amp; Discussion:</b>  <b>out of 15pts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Discusses in detail the experimental results in an orderly manner.</li> <li>•Gives a detailed overview of the material presented in the graphs and figures.</li> <li>•Gives a detailed overview of the authors’ results and discussion. <b>15pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Discusses the experimental results in an orderly manner.</li> <li>•Gives an overview of the material presented in the graphs and figures.</li> <li>•Gives an overview of the authors’ results and discussion. <b>13.5pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Discusses the experimental results, but they are difficult to follow.</li> <li>•Mentions the material presented in the graphs and figures without explaining the implications.</li> <li>•Mentions the authors’ results or their discussion. <b>11.5pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Does not discuss the experimental results.</li> <li>•Mentions that there are graphs and figures without explaining the material presented or does not mention them at all.</li> <li>•Does not mention the authors’ results or their discussion. <b>0-9pts</b></li> </ul>
<b>Conclusion:</b>  <b>out of 15pts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Gives a detailed analysis of the article and the data provided.</li> <li>•Provides an example of future implications for this work using examples from the article where it pertains.</li> <li>•Gives an opinion of the article using examples from the article to support opinion. <b>15pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Gives an analysis of the article or the data provided.</li> <li>•Provides a detailed example of future implications for this work (e.g., assigning botanical origin based on amber chemistry.)</li> <li>•Gives a definite opinion of the article. <b>13.5pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Gives an overview of the article or the data provided.</li> <li>•Provides an example of future implications for this work.</li> <li>•Gives a vague opinion of the article. <b>11.5pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Gives a limited overview of the article or the data provided or no overview.</li> <li>•Does not provide an example of future implications for this work.</li> <li>•Does not include an opinion of the article. <b>0-9pts</b></li> </ul>
<b>References:</b>  <b>out of 5pts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Provides 2 or more references in addition to the 2 reviewed articles.</li> <li>•All cited references are cited using correct MLA format.</li> <li>•References are listed in correct MLA format. <b>5pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Provides 1 reference in addition to the 2 reviewed articles.</li> <li>•All cited references are cited using an acceptable format.</li> <li>•References are listed in an acceptable format. <b>4.5pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Provides no references in addition to the 2 reviewed articles.</li> <li>•References cited, but in an inconsistent manner or quoted references not cited.</li> <li>•References are listed in an acceptable format. <b>3.5pts</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Provides no references including the 2 reviewed articles.</li> <li>•No references are cited even when material is directly quoted.</li> <li>•References are not listed. <b>0-3pts</b></li> </ul>
-> Descriptors for each level of performance <-				