

*\*Note: I gave a set of printed copies of the 3 first draft samples to each team and provided each student with a copy of the assessment rubric. Students read introduction samples and use the rubric before exchanging samples with other students until they have read and assessed all 3. After our class discussion of their evaluations (3), I passed out copies of my comments and the students' edited versions.*

In this exercise, you'll read sample introductions from scientific articles written by previous Biological Oceanography students and provide constructive comments. These students participated in a research cruise off the coast of San Diego, collected plankton and water samples for analysis, and wrote a research paper focused on variation in nearshore plankton communities. Both the structure of the sampling protocols and site locations were similar to the research cruise you conducted this year and which will form the basis of the report you are preparing.

1. Read each first draft and make notes that provide critical analysis and constructive suggestions for the writers. Score each draft according to the Assessment Rubric.
2. List your assessment scores on the whiteboard.
3. Compare your assessment scores and constructive suggestions with other students in your team. Next, we'll have a class discussion about your observations and compare them to my assessment scores.
  - How consistent were scores among different student reviewers?
  - In what area were the scores most and least consistent among different reviewers?
  - How does reading these first drafts influence your plans for introduction outlines?
4. Read my comments to the students and their final drafts of the introduction.
5. In which ways did each student most successfully respond to comments on their draft?
6. What do you think were their less successful changes?

Assessment Rubric for the Introduction:

	Basic (1)	Developing (2)	Advanced (3)
General Impressions	Vague or too general; some concepts misunderstood or poorly articulated; vague connection to the rest of the paper; Grammatical and/or spelling errors.	Presents the context for the study and articulates the connections between the background and objectives. Few grammatical or spelling errors. May still needs some editing for conciseness.	Concise, well written; effectively presents the context for the study; statements focused; thematically connected to the entire paper, especially the discussion; builds up to a clear statement of objectives or null hypotheses
Synthesis in introduction	Lacks synthesis of the information, leaving each article as a standalone piece and/or misinterprets the information and makes statements unsupported by the literature.	Few references used; general descriptions with weak connections to the study; Weak connections made between ideas. Order of concepts is illogical or difficult to follow.	Shows insightful synthesis of the literature, including analysis of gaps in or limitations of the research. Consistently focused on the main topic.
Integration	Does not relate research focus to the larger field of science.	Relation between research focus and larger field of science vaguely or incompletely explained.	Clearly explains how research focus relates to the larger field of science.
Hypothesis and predicted outcomes	Does not state specific and testable hypothesis in clear and proper format. Does not state predicted outcomes.	Does present hypothesis but it is not in proper format and/or is not concisely stated. Does not clearly state predicted outcomes.	Presents hypothesis clearly and concisely in proper format. States predicted outcomes in a clear and concise manner.