

Name: _____ Total Points: _____

Written Journal Club Report (Graduate Students, 5 pages)

| Criteria | Excellent – 9 -10 points | Good – 7 – 8 points | Fair – 5 -6 points | Poor – 1 – 4 points |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Organization of written report (__ of 10 points) | Report is clear and logical. Reader can easily follow line of reasoning. | Report is generally clear. A few minor points may be confusing. | Reader can follow Report with effort. Organization not well thought out. | Report is very confusing and unclear. Reader cannot follow it. |
| Report Style (__ of 10 points) | Style is appropriate for explanation of scientific results. Not too casual. Reader can clearly understand impact and purpose of the selected studies. | Style is generally appropriate. May have some trouble in explaining results or purpose of the selected studies. | Report is too informal or unprepared. Difficult to understand. Much of information lacks focus and clarity. | Report is consistently at an inappropriate level. Information is not well synthesized. Reader can't understand the point of the selected studies. |
| Content: Depth (__ of 10 points) | Design, methods, results, discussion, and conclusions from metagenomic studies are clearly and coherently elucidated. Logical and persuasive agreement between data and conclusions. Impact and implications of results discussed. | Description of metagenomic studies and results is generally clear. Some discussion of what results mean. | Description of metagenomic studies is minimal or missing. Little discussion of what results mean. | Description of metagenomic studies is very difficult to follow. No discussion of meaning of results. Reader learns little about the core topic area. |
| Content: Accuracy (__ of 10 points) | Information given is consistently accurate. Facts are correct. | No significant errors are made. Reader recognizes errors as result of oversight. | Enough errors made to be distracting, but some information is accurate. | Information is so inaccurate that reader cannot depend on the reported results. |
| Final synthesis and summary of results in the focus area (__ of 10 points) | Main study questions are directly addressed and clarified in the scope of related work. | Generally responsive to main study questions in the focus area. Work is put in a general framework of related work. | Report poorly addresses research questions in the focus area. Very little connection to related work. | Not responsive to research questions in a focus area. Little to no connection to prior work in the field. |