

Scientific Communication Writing Assignment Rubric – Peer Evaluation

your name: Jenna Mackenroth

assignment reviewed: 102

Using the rubric below, please evaluate each of your assigned news articles in each of the areas shown, filling out a separate evaluation form for each news article. Please highlight the part of the rubric text that explains why you chose a specific assessment category. In the “General Feedback” section at the bottom of this form, please include more specific feedback, including things that you liked as well as things that you feel could be improved upon and suggestions on how to improve them.

	Excellent	Good	Needs Improvement
Content: Does the news article convey the writer’s understanding of a biological topic?	The news article introduces a biological topic and clearly illustrates the writer’s understanding of the topic including what is known and not known about it and how understanding the biology associated with the topic helps us understand larger issues or concepts.	The news article introduces a biological topic and presents information about it, but the topic is not explained clearly or doesn’t distinguish between what is known vs. what is not known or doesn’t explain how understanding the biology associated with the topic helps us understand larger issues or concepts.	The news article does not illustrate the writers understanding of the topic and does not indicate what is known vs. what is not known or how understanding the biology associated with the topic helps us understand larger issues or concepts.
Audience: Is the writing appropriate for the target audience?	The news article avoids jargon and clearly defines terms and ideas for a non-expert audience.	The news article defines or explains some terms, but some key terms or ideas would be challenging for a non-expert audience.	The news article lacks definitions and explanations, making the topic inaccessible to a non-expert audience.
Organization: Is the news article clearly organized?	The news article is well organized and easy to follow with good transitions between the paragraphs.	The news article is generally organized and easy to follow but conceptual connections aren’t always clear.	The news article is disorganized, and the information presented doesn’t flow well.

Rubric continues on next page

	Excellent	Good	Needs Improvement
Format, spelling & grammar: Does the news article follow the recommended format and is it free of writing errors?	The news article follows guidelines for paper length and format and has been carefully proofread for spelling and grammatical mistakes.	The news article is outside the recommended length or does not conform to the formatting guidelines; the news article contains a small number of spelling and/or grammatical errors.	The news article is significantly outside the recommended length and does not conform to the formatting guidelines; the news article contains numerous spelling and/or grammatical errors.
Citations: Are the citations presented appropriately?	The news article contains appropriate in-text citations and a list of references for all source material.	The news article is missing either appropriate in-text citations or a list of references.	The news article is missing appropriate in-text citations and a list of references OR citations are missing for one or more sources.
Rationale for choosing topic: Did the writer indicate why they chose the topic?	The rationale for choosing the topic is clearly explained.		No rationale for the topic's choice is provided.

General feedback (5 points): Overall, I think this author did a good job of delivering otherwise complex information to a general audience. I enjoyed the attention lent to the current development of PCI's, and I thought that the topic was interesting, and information about it was well developed. There was some room for improvement: first, the paper lacked in-text citations (but had a great list of sources at the end of the page)—just remember to cite each bit of information directly to the source it came from. Second, the first and second paragraphs were full of filler information that could be either deleted or delivered more succinctly; the first line of the second paragraph, for example, has unnecessary information about the complexity of the brain, when the article should be centered on the complexity of the immune system. The introductory paragraph also briefly includes ideas about news media “generalizing and sensationalizing” information about cancer treatment, but this idea is never brought up again, nor is it relevant to the description of immunotherapy. Cutting down on the first two paragraphs—perhaps even condensing them into one—would open up some space to go into greater detail about immunotherapy. (A small detail; if you're using APA-style formatting, they use the Oxford comma.)

Overall assessment (excellent, good, needs improvement): Good (especially the last two paragraphs). Needs improvement (the first two).