

Bio101 (Kay) Review Paper – Grading Rubric

NOTE: You must print this and ATTACH it to the paper copy you submit.

40 pts: Scientific merit

- ___/5 Does the paper address a well-defined topic in botany?
- ___/5 Does the paper adequately survey the scientific literature to provide a current and accurate summary of what is known? (It is OK to report that there is not a strong consensus among the published papers that were surveyed).
- ___/5 Is the paper based upon well-referenced scientific information?
- ___/5 Does the author avoid editorializing (i.e., statement of opinion)?
- ___/10 Does the author identify and synthesize trends in research articles he/she references, such that he/she can make valid generalizations about the current state of knowledge in a topic (i.e., does the author avoid mindlessly listing the results of many studies)?
- ___/10 Does the author identify gaps in the current understanding of the topic, and propose future research to fill these gaps?

20 pts: Research

- ___/5 Does the paper include at least 10 peer-reviewed original scientific articles? (This number does NOT include review articles, though they may be cited).
- ___/5 Are the articles used appropriately in the text to support statements made by the author?
- ___/5 Is the research current? Literature cites must include at least three peer-review original research articles published in the past five years.
- ___/5 Does the research extend far back into history of the topic to adequately capture this history?

20 pts: Clarity of writing and grammar

- ___/5 Are sentences properly constructed (i.e., not “run-on”, contain a verb, subject, and object, do not end in a prepositional phrase, have commas in proper location if necessary, etc.)? Is the paper free of spelling mistakes and grammatical errors?
- ___/5 Are paragraphs structured as discrete units of information that address a particular idea?
- ___/5 Do paragraphs begin with a topic sentence that introduces the main idea, and are paragraphs typically comprised of 3-5 sentences?
- ___/5 Is the writing overly bombastic or colloquial (avoid!), or is the writing concise and free of superfluous verbiage (aspire to this!)?

10 pts: Structural organization of paper

- ___/2 Review article contains the required sections: title, author information, abstract (no more than 300 words), introduction, subtopic sections (each with a title), and literature cited. These section headings appear in bold font (no section headings for the title or author information).
- ___/2 Body of article (i.e., introduction and subtopic sections) is appropriate length to adequately address topic (**≥2000 words**...remember that the abstract does not count towards the 2000 word minimum!).
- ___/3 Article contains three figures (one map/photo, two data figures), each of which is properly captioned, labeled, referenced in the text, and embedded in an appropriate location in text.
- ___/2 Subtopic sections are “meaningful” divisions within paper and do not appear to be superficially applied after text was written.
- ___/1 Article is printed in Calibri, Arial, or Times New Roman font (11 or 12 pt.), 1.5 line spacing, pages are numbered middle bottom of every page.

10 pts: Literature Cited section

- ___/4 All references in the *Literature Cited* section are properly formatted per *The Botanical Review*, are free of typos and stray punctuation etc., and are in alphabetical order.
- ___/3 References within the text are appropriately formatted (for example: Smith, 2015) and actually refer to papers in the literature cited.
- ___/3 References with more than three authors are cited in the text as “Lead author et al., date” (e.g., Smith et al., 2015).