

	Exemplary (12-11)	Acceptable (10-7)	Developing (6-4)	Unacceptable (3-0)	Score
Organization/ Mechanics	Paper is well organized, has a very clear intro, methods, results and discussion. The purpose of the paper is clear from the very beginning. There are few or no grammar mistakes.	Paper is organized, has an intro, methods, results and discussion. The purpose of the paper becomes clear within the report. There are few grammatical and spelling errors, but they do not detract from the report.	Paper is organized, has an intro, methods, results and discussion. The purpose of the paper is never clearly stated. There are a number grammatical and spelling errors that detract from the report, but overall message can be discerned	Paper is not well organized, has unclear intro, methods, results and discussion. The purpose of the paper is unclear. Grammatical and spelling errors are so numerous as to make the critique incomprehensible	
Introduction	Paper has a very clear introduction. The broader context of the experiment/research is clear. The appropriate literature is cited correctly, and hypotheses/questions are very clearly stated.	Paper has a clear introduction. The broader context of the experiment/research is not as obvious. The literature is cited, and hypotheses/questions are stated.	Paper has an introduction. The broader context of the experiment/research is not well articulated. The literature is not cited, and hypotheses/questions are not clear.	Paper has an introduction. There is no broader context of the experiment/research. The literature is not cited and hypotheses/questions are not stated.	
Methods	The data collected is clearly stated and related to the hypotheses/questions presented in the introduction. The units are stated. The reader could repeat the methods.	The data collected is stated and related to the hypotheses/questions presented in the introduction. The methods may be able to be reproduced by the reader.	The data collected is stated but does not relate to the hypotheses/questions presented in the introduction. It is not evident how the reader will reproduce the results.	The data collected is not stated and does not relate to the hypotheses/questions presented in the introduction. The reader would not be able to reproduce the study.	
Results	The results are very clearly stated, with statistical results, appropriate units and match the methods. The figure/table of the data clearly demonstrates the relationships. The figure/table are well labeled, with axes labels where appropriate and dependent/independent variables on the appropriate axes.	The results are stated, with units and mention of statistics, with information lacking. Some of the results do not match the data collection in the methods. The figure/table of the data demonstrate the relationships, but are not as clearly labeled.	The results are stated, but no units are given and statistics aren't mentioned. More of the results do not match the data collection in the methods. The figure/table of the data do not clearly the show the relationships and are not labeled.	The results do match the methods and/or the hypotheses/questions in the introduction. The results are not presented in a table or figure. The relationship of data are not clear. No statistics used.	
Discussion	The discussion very clearly ties the results back to the hypotheses/questions and broader picture as mentioned in the introduction. It is clearly stated whether the results support or refute the hypotheses/questions. Alternative explanations for the data are clearly stated and follow up questions are addressed.	The discussion ties the results back to the hypotheses/questions and broader picture as mentioned in the introduction. Whether the results support or refute the hypotheses/questions is stated. Follow up questions are addressed.	The discussion does not clearly tie the results back to the hypotheses/questions and broader picture as mentioned in the introduction. It is not clear whether the results support or refute the hypotheses/questions is stated. Follow up questions and alternative explanations of the data are not given.	The discussion does not tie the results back to the hypotheses/questions and broader picture as mentioned in the introduction. It is not mentioned whether the results support or refute the hypotheses/questions is stated. Follow up questions and alternative explanations of the data are not given.	

