

Appendix III: Scoring Rubric for Biol 515 Term Papers. Points are Doubled for a 200-pt Scale (Fall 2005, Dr. B.T. Hentschel)

Level of Achievement	Organization	Content: Existing Knowledge	Content: Original Ideas	Use of Literature	Grammar, Spelling, Literature Citations
Exemplary (90-100 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (27-30 pts) • Main topic stated clearly. • Paper organized into at least 3 sections defined by topical headings. • Paragraphs each focus on a common subtopic. • Transitional phrases used to link ideas presented in different paragraphs and different sections. • Ordering of sections, paragraphs, sentences, and ideas flows logically. • Existing knowledge and original ideas are integrated logically. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (27-30 pts) • The paper provides a comprehensive overview of existing knowledge. • Major topics are explained in much more detail than that presented in invertebrate biology textbooks. • The author demonstrates his/her expertise in the subject matter relative to the more general knowledge expected of all Biol 515 students. • Existing knowledge is both summarized and interpreted in a conceptual framework. • Terms and jargon are defined. • Key concepts are explained. • Data tables or figures, if present, supplement information in the text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (18-20 pts) • Paper includes at least 6 original ideas. These might include suggestions for future research or the author's original synthesis or interpretation of existing knowledge. • All original ideas are identifiable as the author's original ideas. • Includes at least 2 suggestions for future research. • Includes at least 2 original interpretations/syntheses. • All original ideas are grounded in a factual basis of some sort (e.g., similar research has been done on another organism) and appropriate literature is cited to support the idea's merit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (9-10 pts) • Provides a comprehensive review, synthesis, and integration of info from the scientific literature. • Cites at least 25 total literature sources • Cites at least 15 articles from primary literature • Only literature cited parenthetically in the text of the paper is listed as "Literature Cited" at the end of the paper • No more than 2 stated facts are unsupported by literature citations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (9-10 pts) • No more than 1 spelling or typographical error • No more than 1 grammatically incorrect sentence • All literature citations follow the formats used in the journal <i>Ecology</i>.
Quality (75-85 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (23-26 pts) As above, but • Inadequate transitions • Inadequate integration of knowledge & original ideas. • 1-2 paragraphs lack a clear topical focus. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (23-26 pts) As above, but... • 1-2 major topics require more discussion. • Additional library research does not seem to be needed, just more thought, synthesis, or clarification by the author. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (15-17 pts) As above, but... • 5 original ideas • 2-3 suggestions for future research. • 2-3 original interpretations/syntheses. • Most original ideas are grounded in fact and appropriate literature is cited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (7-8 pts) As above, but... • 18-24 total lit sources • 12-14 primary literature • 3-4 stated facts lack cited references 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (7-8 pts) • 2-3 misspellings or typos • 2-3 grammatically incorrect sentences • A few minor deviations from <i>Ecology</i> formats
Adequate (50-70)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (16-22 pts) As above, but • 3-5 paragraphs lack a clear topical focus. • Paper includes a few unnecessarily redundant statements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (16-22 pts) As above, but... • A few major topics must be discussed or researched in more detail. • Needs some additional library research. • 1-3 terms are not defined for the reader. • 1-3 key concepts are not explained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (10-14 pts) As above, but... • 4 original ideas • 2 suggestion for future research. • 2 original interpretations/syntheses. • A few original ideas are not grounded in a referenced fact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (4-6 pts) As above, but... • 15-17 total lit sources • 8-11 primary literature • 5-6 stated facts lack cited references 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (4-6 pts) • 4-6 misspellings or typos • 4-6 grammatically incorrect sentences • Several minor deviations from <i>Ecology</i> formats
Needs Improvement (10-45 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (5-15 pts) • Paper does not flow logically. • Poor integration of knowledge and original ideas. • Paper contains more than 5 redundancies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (5-15 pts) As above, but... • Major topics are not covered in more detail than in invertebrate textbooks. • Paper summarizes existing knowledge, but does not synthesize or interpret these facts within a conceptual framework. • > 3 terms are not defined. • > 3 key concepts are not explained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (0-9 pts) as above, but... • < 4 original ideas • Most original ideas are absurd or are not grounded in a referenced fact. • Some potentially original ideas are presented ambiguously (i.e., Is that the author's idea or did s/he forget a literature citation?). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (0-3 pts) As above, but... • 10-14 total lit sources • 5-7 primary literature • > 6 stated facts lack cited references. • The majority of citations come from fewer than 4 different sources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (0-3 pts) • > 6 misspellings or typos • > 6 grammatically incorrect sentences • Doesn't follow <i>Ecology</i> formats