

FS Bio 201 Report Checklist for TAs:

This “checklist” should alert you to some problems that frequently surface in first drafts of FS Bio 201 papers. Because reading and thinking about student writing is incredibly time-consuming, TAs can only use this “checklist” to point out potential problem areas without giving you written feedback about the exact nature of each problem or its solution. Please consult the appropriate pages of the textbook to see if you can figure out how to improve your paper and then discuss the “trouble spots” with your TA or the instructor before you write the final draft of your paper. Turn this checklist back in together with the first and second drafts of your paper.

author _____

reviewer _____

Introduction:

- citation format in text not correct
- citation format in reference list not correct
- did not cite at least 4 primary research papers
- did not cite at least 5 sources total
- rationale for use of experimental organisms explained ___insufficiently / ___not at all
- question addressed and why it is important ___insufficiently / ___not explained
- summarized published work on the question ___insufficiently / ___not at all
- explained novelty of presented study ___insufficiently / ___not at all
- should ask for help with:*
 - O grammar/sentence structure
 - O word choice
 - O paragraph structure
 - O overall organization
- should watch out for:*
 - O typographical errors

Methods:

- includes dates and location of field work
- described materials used ___insufficiently / ___not at all
- Latin species names ___missing / ___not *italicized* / ___genus not capitalized with species name lower case
- described methods used ___insufficiently / ___not at all
- used clear and logical organization

Literature Cited for Introduction and Methods:

- missing sources that were cited in the text
- incorrect format for references

FS Bio201 Report Checklist for TAs (Part II):

author _____

reviewer _____

Title:

- too general
- too long: "filler" words too much info rearrange words

Abstract:

- introduction to problem/question _____ missing / _____ needs work
- summary of method/approach used for answering question ____ missing / ____ needs work
- main results ____ missing / ____ need work
- interpretation/meaning of results, take-home message _____ missing / _____ needs work
- not between 150 and 300 words total

Results:

- table format needs _____ minor / _____ major revisions
- figure format needs ____ minor / ____ major revisions
- figure / table legend(s) _____ absent / insufficient
- figures / tables not numbered in the same order as they are mentioned in the text
- some figures / tables not mentioned in the text
- figure(s) / table(s) missing
- description of results _____ too detailed / _____ insufficiently detailed / _____ missing
- description of results mixed with interpretations
- raw data included in results section instead of appendix

Discussion:

- makes _____ no / _____ too little reference to figures and tables
- makes _____ no / _____ too little reference to published literature
- does not discuss results in context of hypothesis/original question
- does not discuss possible reasons for differences between expected and actual results
- does not discuss implications of results and propose potentially interesting follow-up experiments
- does not support discussion with references to published work

Literature Cited for Entire Paper:

- missing sources that were cited in the text
- incorrect format for references
- does not include at least _____ four primary research papers / _____ five sources total for the entire paper