

### SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL 3

| Group name:        |   |  |  |   |   | Points |
|--------------------|---|--|--|---|---|--------|
| TITLE              | 0 point<br>Missing  | 1 point<br>Inaccurate or too lengthy of description  | 2 points<br>Concise accurate title representative of the work completed  |   |   | /2     |
| INTRODUCTION       | 0 point<br>Missing  | 1-2 points<br>Lacks clarity and is missing multiple primary elements (ex: no description of goal, inadequate mention, or no mention of methods); too short | 3-5 points<br>Lacks clarity; missing a primary element (goal or method); methods are only listed without purpose recognized  | 6-8 points<br>Lacks full clarity or too lengthy of a description of the goals and methods   | 9-10 points<br>Clearly and concisely explains the goal of the experiment and primary methods used.  | /10    |
| METHODS            | 0-3 points<br>Missing or copied from the lab manual   | 4-7 points<br>Several methods are omitted; others are presented in a piecemeal, vague form.  | 8-10 points<br>Methods are listed as tables or figures, and/or bullet points rather than text; Some methods are omitted. The purpose of the method steps is omitted.   | 11-13 points<br>Some methods are presented so briefly and/or vaguely that it is unclear how or why they were done. Written as a protocol rather than a description.                       | 14-15 points<br>Gives the reader a clear picture of the methods and materials used and their purpose. Does not use prescriptive language. Uses specific, not general, terminology. Detailed, step-by-step procedures are clearly referenced. Avoids long, redundant descriptions. | /15    |
| RESULTS -DATA      | 0-4 points<br>Missing many pieces of data (figures, tables, etc.)   | 5-8 points<br>Data is included but legends are not present. Irrelevant data may be included, and relevant data left out.                                   | 9-12 points<br>Data is presented haphazardly. It is sometimes not possible to tell what material or procedure was used to obtain the data.   | 13-16 points<br>All or most of the data is present. Legends may be too brief, vague, or uninformative. Controls or borrowed data not clearly indicated.                                   | 17-20 points<br>All figures and tables have titles and legends with all items labeled. All results are clearly presented, with a logical sequence. Controls are clearly indicated. Borrowed data is referenced.   | /20    |
| RESULTS-TEXT       | 0-4 points<br>Missing textual description of the results (text other than figure legends/table headings)  | 5-8 points<br>Text lacks full description of each item in each figure, table, etc. No logical connection between methods and data                          | 9-12 points<br>Text presents most data but haphazardly and is difficult to follow.   | 13-16 points<br>Text clearly presents almost all data. Comparisons of experimental to control results are stated.   | 17-20 points<br>Clear, Full description in the text of each item in each figure, table, etc. Comparisons of experimental to control results are stated  | /20    |
| DISCUSSION         | 0-4 points<br>Missing textual descriptions of the results (text other than figure legends/table headings) | 5-8 points<br>Mostly a restatement of results. No analysis given. No recognition of error sources. No understanding of controls.                           | 9-12 points<br>Very little analysis of the results. Statements are vague and general. Inconsistencies are explained by 'human error' with no further explanation or discussion of other alternative sources of error. Biological meaning is not discussed. | 13-16 points<br>Some lack of clarity. Summary of results or expectations are not included. Incomplete analysis of inconsistencies and unexpected results (sources of error unidentified). | 17-20 points<br>It was clear that methods and results have been understood. Summary of results included and compared to expectations. Possible explanations for inconsistencies and/or unexpected results are given. All data is referenced and discussed                         | /20    |
| REFERENCES         | 0 point<br>No citations or relevant sources   | 1-2 points<br>Citation of references but inconsistent formatting or lack of citations in the text. Or other relevant external sources are missing          | 3-5 points<br>Citation of some articles but less than 15 external citations from reputable journals. Inconsistent formatting Lack of in text citations   | 6-8 points<br>Citation of at least 15 external citations from reputable journals. In text citations but bibliography not annotated  | 9-10 points<br>Citation of 15 external citations from reputable journals. In text citations and bibliography annotated at the end   | /10    |
| SPELLING & GRAMMAR | 0 point<br>Frequent grammatical errors or misuse of technical terminology; no evidence of proofreading    | 1 point<br>Multiple grammatical errors or incorrect use of technical terminology   | 2 points<br>An occasional error  | 3 points<br>No spelling or grammatical errors   |   | /3     |
| COMMENTS:          |   |  |  |   | TOTAL   | /100   |