

Graduate Writing Requirement

Thesis/Project Proposal Department of Biology California State University, Fresno

Student Name: _____

Date: _____

Committee

Chair: _____

Member: _____

Member: _____

Member: _____

Overview

In consultation with your Thesis/Project committee you have prepared your GWR in one of two formats:

Grant Proposal

Journal Publication

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

Materials

It is your responsibility to provide:

Proposal sheet
GWR
Rubric
Score sheet

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

Requirements

Sections	YES	NO
Title		
Summary/Abstract		
Specific Aims (optional)*		
Project Description/Introduction		
Experimental Design/Methods		
Preliminary Data (optional)*		
References		
Timeline (optional)*		
Budget (optional)*		

*The following is to be included in the GWR based on format chosen and must be approved by the chair prior to submission to the rest of your committee. Refer to Thesis proposal guidelines for complete description

Evaluation

Your committee will evaluate using the Biology Departments scoring rubric and you will be scored from 1-5 in the following four areas:

- I. Style and format
- II. Mechanics
- III. Content and organization
- IV. Integration and critical analysis

Dates & Deadlines

Date submitted: _____

Date scores requested: _____

Please allow two weeks for your committee to mark your GWR and submit your scores

Deadlines:

_____ Error! Bookmark not defined.

If you have impending deadlines that require your committee to grade in less than two weeks, please provide data above.

Note: meeting this deadline is not guaranteed

Signature of Student

Signature of Committee Chair

Department of Biology
Writing Requirement Evaluation Summary Sheet

Student Name: _____

Date: _____

Committee member (Name)	Date	Rubric Area				Total Score
		I	II	III	IV	

GWR Scoring Rubric

I. Style and Format:

5 (Exemplary): In addition to meeting the requirement for a "4," the paper consistently models the language and conventions used in the scholarly/ professional literature appropriate to the student's discipline. The student's GWR would meet the guidelines for submission for publication in a peer reviewed biological journal in the student's field of study or the meet the guidelines necessary to submit as a proposal for federal funding (e.g. NIH, NSF)

4 (Accomplished): While there may be minor errors, conventions for style and format are used consistently throughout the paper. Demonstrates thoroughness and competence in documenting sources; the reader would have little difficulty referring back to cited sources. Style and format contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper. Suitably models the discipline's overall publication or proposal style.

3 (Satisfactory): The style and format are broadly followed, but inconsistencies are apparent. There is selection of less suitable scientific sources (non-peer reviewed literature, web information). Weak transitions and apparent logic gaps occur between topics being addressed. The style may be difficult to follow so as to detract from the comprehensibility of the manuscript.

2 (Developing): While some biological conventions are followed, others are not. Paper lacks consistency of style and/or format. It may be unclear which references are direct quotes and which are paraphrased. Based on the information provided, the reader would have some difficulty referring back to cited sources. Significant revisions would contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper.

1 (Beginning): The stylistic conventions of scientific writing are not followed. Fails to demonstrate thoroughness and competence in documentation. Inappropriate style and format make reading and comprehensibility problematic.

II. Mechanics:

5 (Exemplary): In addition to meeting the requirements for a "4," the paper is essentially error free in terms of mechanics. Writing flows smoothly from one idea to another. Transitions effectively establish a sound scholarly argument and aid the reader in following the writer's logic.

4 (Accomplished): While there may be minor errors, the paper follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout. Errors do not significantly interfere with topic comprehensibility. Transitions and organizational structures such as subheadings are effectively used which help the reader move from one point to another.

3 (Satisfactory): Grammatical conventions are generally used, but inconsistency and/or errors in their use result in weak, but still apparent, connections between topics in the formulation of the argument. There is poor or improper use of headings and related features to keep the reader on track within the topic. Effective scientific vocabulary is used.

2 (Developing): Frequent errors in spelling, grammar (such as subject/verb agreements and tense), sentence structure and/or other writing conventions make reading difficult and interfere with comprehensibility. There is some confusion in the proper use of scientific terms. Writing does not flow smoothly from point to point; appropriate transitions are lacking.

1 (Beginning): Paper contains numerous errors in spelling, grammar, and/or sentence structure, which make following the logic of the paper extremely difficult. Scientific terms are misused.

III. Content and Organization:

5 (Exemplary): In addition to meeting the requirements for a "4," excels in the organization and representation of ideas related to the topic. Raises important issues or ideas, which may not have been represented in the literature cited. Would serve as a good basis for further research on the topic. Is formatted to peer-reviewed journal appropriate to the field or as a grant proposal to the appropriate funding agency.

4 (Accomplished): Follows all requirements for the paper. Topic is carefully focused. Clearly outlines the major points related to the topic; ideas are logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument. Paper is interesting and holds the reader's attention. Does a credible job summarizing related literature. General ideas are expanded upon in a logical manner thereby extending the significance of the work presented beyond a re-statement of known ideas.

3 (Satisfactory): Ideas presented closely follow conventional concepts with little expansion and development of new directions. Certain logical connections or inclusion of specific topics related to the student's area of study may be omitted. Ideas and concepts are generally satisfactorily presented although lapses in logic and organization are apparent. The reader is suitably introduced to the topic being presented such that the relationship to the student's area of study is obvious.

2 (Developing): The paper is logically and thematically coherent, but is lacking in substantial ways. The content may be poorly focused or the scholarly argument weak or poorly conceived. Major ideas related to the content may be ignored or inadequately explored. Overall, the content and organization needs significant revision to represent a critical analysis of the topic.

1 (Beginning): Analysis of existing scholarly / professional literature on the topic is inadequate. Content is poorly focused and lacks organization. The reader is left with little information about or little understanding of the paper's topic.

IV. Integration and Critical Analysis:

5 (Exemplary): The document presents the current state of knowledge for the topic being addressed utilizing a diversity of scientific opinions. These various, and possibly conflicting, opinions are presented in a balanced manner and seamlessly woven together to illustrate a complete grasp of the scientific literature across multiple research approaches utilizing appropriate national and international peer-reviewed journals. Essential findings of multiple

sources are accurately and concisely paraphrased, analyzed, and integrated. Original sources are clearly identified and correctly cited in both the body of the text and the reference section. Organizationally, smooth and effective transitions between topics lead the reader through an orderly discussion of the topic being addressed. The gaps in current knowledge are clearly identified and significant directions and approaches that fill these gaps are identified.

4 (Accomplished): There are inconsistencies in the organization and logic of the presentation, but still clear analysis of the presented materials. While synthesis of all aspects of the topic may show varying degrees of development, the overall consistency, thoroughness, and analysis result in a well-crafted document.

3 (Satisfactory): Identification of key topics or uncertainties in the field may be incomplete. New concepts resulting from a synthetic presentation of ideas is poorly developed or lacking. Complex topics and related concepts are awkwardly presented and linkages among topics may be unclear.

2 (Developing): Weakness is evident in the coverage of the field and analysis resulting in incorrect or poorly developed synthesis of results. Analysis is limited to categorizing and summarizing scientific topics. The resulting manuscript significantly degrades the comprehensibility of the document and the identification of knowledge gaps.

1 (Beginning): The manuscript contains numerous flaws in the essential components of a literature review. The manuscript lacks a successful synthesis of disparate works, and there is no logical flow to the presentation. These issues result in a manuscript with limited comprehensibility and utility in illustrating the author's effective grasp of the material.