

## LABORATORY REPORT EVALUATION RUBRIC

	<b>EXPERT</b>	<b>ADVANCED</b>	<b>INTERMEDIATE</b>	<b>BEGINNER</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	Presents a clear summary of the reason for performing the experiment. Connects the experimental goals or methods to previous research (from lab handouts, text, journal articles, etc.). Clearly states the hypothesis or purpose of the experiment. (7 points)	Either lacks clarity or is missing one of the primary elements  (5 points)	Weak or missing primary elements.  (3 points)	No real introduction  (1 point)
<b>MATERIALS AND METHODS</b>	Gives the reader a clear picture of the methods and materials used. Does not use prescriptive language. Uses specific, not general, terminology. Detailed, step-by-step procedures are clearly referenced. Avoids long, redundant descriptions. (8 points)	Some methods are presented so briefly and/or vaguely that it is unclear how or why they were done. May be some written as a protocol rather than a description.  (6 points)	Some methods are omitted; others are presented in a piecemeal, vague form  (4 points)	Methods barely mentioned.  (2 points)
<b>RESULTS</b>	All figures and tables have titles and legends. All results are clearly presented, with a logical sequence. Controls are clearly indicated.  (7 points)	Some data may be missing, or legends may be brief, vague or uninformative.  (5 points)	Data is presented haphazardly. It is sometimes not possible to tell what material or procedure was used to obtain the data.  (3 points)	No logical connection between methods and data. Irrelevant data may be included, and relevant data left out. No legends. (1 point)
<b>DISCUSSION</b>	It is clear that the methods and results have been understood. The results (including controls) are related to the questions posed	There may be some lack of clarity. Did the writer understand why certain methods were used, and how the results could shed	Very little analysis of the results. Statements are vague and general. Inconsistencies are explained by 'human error' or something similar.	Mostly a restatement of results. No analysis given. No recognition of error sources. No understanding of

	and analyzed for their effectiveness. Possible explanations for inconsistencies and/or unexpected results are given Includes a conclusion paragraph. Draws appropriate conclusions based on the data that are not overly broad. (7 points)	light on the questions asked? Incomplete analysis of inconsistencies and unexpected results. (5 points)		controls. (1 point)
<b>INTERCONNECTED</b>	It is clear that the report covers a group of related procedures with a clear set of goals. (7 points)	Sometimes the goals are not clearly related to the report. Some fragmentation occurs, with methods and results apparently unrelated to each other. (5 points)	Transitions are abrupt. Activities seem unrelated to each other. Aims are not clearly present throughout. (3 points)	Disjointed. No flow. Very little use of headings, or explanatory sentences. (1 point)
<b>SPELLING AND GRAMMAR</b>	No spelling or grammatical errors (7 points)	An occasional error (5 points)	Apparently not proofread for errors. (3 points)	Frequent grammatical (>20) errors: incomplete sentences, tense changes, misspellings. Next report must be initialed by a TCAEIL* tutor. (1 point)

*\*Tuskegee - Center of Academic Excellence and Innovative Learning (T-CAEIL)*