

Scientific Communication Writing Assignment Rubric – Peer Evaluation

your name: Sadie Doerr-Yazzie

assignment reviewed: #106 - Deep sea salt lakes, the organisms that live there, and how they could help fight cancer

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. While reading I felt you had a decent understanding of marine biology aspect, but there was not a lot of information showing your understanding of the study its self.	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	The news article lacks definitions and explanations, making the topic inaccessible to a non-expert audience.

		challenging for a non-expert audience. Some terms that didn't have any definition are osmotic pressure, electron acceptor (mainly the importance is needed), and hypoxia.	
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. While reading it felt more like I was learning somewhat aligned facts about the deep ocean and the deep sea salt lakes more than how all of that is the basis for a study into how those organisms can be used for cancer research.	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 paper is two lines over the page limit, but that might be due to the empty line on the first page.	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. This article has no in-text citations where they should be present.	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):

This article was alright, although it felt like a rush at the end of it when the study was mentioned abruptly. I can appreciate the amount of detail that was put into the research for the deep sea salt lake ecosystem and I found all that information to be quite interesting. But that information seemed to be taking up the whole article.

Overall assessment (excellent, good, needs improvement):

I would say this article was overall good, but could use some improvements in certain areas listed above.