Scientific Communication Writing Assignment Rubric – Peer Evaluation

your name: Gwen Rewoldt

assignment reviewed: 6 – Sophia Beckmann

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):

Content – The news article clearly conveys the writers understanding of how the similar immune systems between zebra fish and mammals (such as humans) "opens the door" to further immunology research as the zebra fish can be used as a model. The clear definitions of dendritic cells, the particular immune cells of interest in this article, and the articulation of the experiment performed naturally builds to the concluding paragraph on the uses of further immunology research.
Audience – I think the writer does a great job of giving clear definitions on dendritic cells and antigen presenting cells. I wonder if the use of other cell names (neutrophils, T cells, macrophages, B cells, platelets, and NK cells) is necessary, but they are also defined well enough in the context of this paper as examples of immune cells in the anime. Also, I suggest defining the terms myeloid and plasmacytoid as I had to look them up.
Organization – Paragraphs are well organized. The last three paragraphs flow together well, with clear shifts between each (defining dendritic cells, explaining the experiment that involved DCs, and then ending with the conclusions they made and further research potential). The first paragraph could have a more smooth transition into the second, but the shift in ideas is clear and the first paragraph is relevant to the rest of the paper.

Format, spelling, and grammar – I didn't see any spelling or grammar mistakes and the paper meets the guidelines of two pages in length.

Citations – Does an excellent job of citing sources in text and in reference list at the end. Very clear when writer references another text.

Rationale – Writer indicates a personal interest in the immune system structure by introducing their topic via an anime they like.

Overall assessment (excellent, good, needs improvement): Excellent