

Geol 501 Rubric for Summaries

Writer: _____

Date on summary: _____

| | Yes | Some what | No |
|--|-----|-----------|----|
| General (10%) | | | |
| Is the summary organized into the appropriate sections? (Reference, clear statement of the problem/intro, methods, results and uncertainties, conclusions, discussion, critique) | | | |
| Is the use of grammar, spelling, and transitions correct? | | | |
| Is the writing succinct? | | | |
| Heading Information (5%) | | | |
| Does the writer give the full reference information for the paper they critiqued? | | | |
| Is the reference information in AGU or GSA style? | | | |
| Is it clear who wrote the summary and when they wrote it? | | | |
| Introduction (15%) | | | |
| Does the introduction provide a clear statement of the scientific problem posed or hypothesis tested? | | | |
| Does it frame the context (significance) of the study? | | | |
| Methods (15%) | | | |
| Are the methods clearly explained? Is the data gathering strategy clearly laid out? | | | |
| Is the relevance of the approach evident? | | | |
| Is it clear whether and how uncertainties were treated in this study? | | | |
| Results (15%) | | | |
| Are the pertinent results summarized? | | | |
| Can you tell if the results were conveyed in useful figures and tables? | | | |
| Does the summary comment on the results being free of interpretation? | | | |
| Does the summary comment on the whether the uncertainties are clearly stated? | | | |
| Discussion (15%) | | | |
| Is the interpretation of the data related to the hypotheses or questions articulated in the Introduction? | | | |
| Is the significance of the results elucidated? | | | |
| Does the discussion set up the conclusions? | | | |
| Conclusions (10%) | | | |
| Does the summary explain whether the conclusions are substantiated? | | | |
| Is their significance revisited or clear? | | | |
| Critique (15%) | | | |
| Does the summary contain a brief assessment of either the strengths, weaknesses, or both of the article? | | | |

Give at least five further comments on the back. Choose from the above topics and give suggestions for further improvement (especially!!) or specific examples of what the writer did well. For example, if the writer did not clearly differentiate between Results and Interpretation, point this out and show them where they confused the two. If the Introduction is stunning clear and compelling, say so and explain why.