

Response Paper, Biol-1, revised Fall 2015

We have already written one critique of a scientific journal article. We now have an opportunity to delve a little deeper into your ideas and further questions. The objectives of this second paper are to:

- provide you with an opportunity to read more about topics that you find fascinating.
- provide an additional opportunity to practice your skeptical criticism of scientific work.

Instructions:

Phase 1 of assignment: Starting with your article

1. Choose an article of interest to you, at least 2500 words long, from the following list of periodicals:
 - New Scientist
 - Science News
 - Discover
 - Physician and Sports Medicine
 - Scientific American
 - Skeptical Inquirer
 - Natural History
 - Science (the briefs near the front of each issue)
 - Nature (the briefs near the front of each issue)
2. Print a complete, readable copy of your article, and write your name at the top.
3. Write a citation of the article on the front page, in this format: Citation format: Author names. Year published. Article title. Journal name, Volume number (Edition): Page numbers.
 - Example: Briggs, C. 2014. Glass blowers and their exposure to thermophilic *Escherichia* in molten products. Journal of Interesting-Sounding Example Studies, 31(2): 123-125.

Rubric for Phase 1:	Article turned in:	6 pts
	At least 2500 words:	2 pts
	<u>Complete citation:</u>	<u>2 pts</u>
	Total:	10 pts

Phase 2 of assignment: Writing your response

1. For your paper, your assignment is respond to the article, addressing any of the following issues:
 - Consider the article from the perspective of the scientific process and scientific philosophy.
 - Consider the article from the perspective of your own experiences.
 - Evaluate the scientific quality of the article.
 - Relate the article to what we have learned in class.
 - Describe further questions that came to your mind as you read the article.
 - Note: There is no need to summarize the article; it is more important to share your own ideas.

Strategies and tips:

- Don't worry if you don't write much during your first reading of the article. Look up all the words that are unfamiliar to you, and write down definitions. Enjoy the article you selected. Immerse yourself in the ideas. You may find it helpful to sleep on your discoveries and then get down to more structured work the next day, during the next one or two readings.
- Avoid highlighting. Instead, write your own thoughts in the margins and on your note paper.
- Try to think of questions that start with "How...?", "Why...?", and "What if...?"
- One strategy is to make a table with "Facts" in one column, and "Ideas and Questions" in another.
- Use your scientific filters to sort your thoughts and questions into what is scientific and what is not.
- Now you've got the pieces of an essay with substance!

2. Write an outline, organizing your ideas.
3. Write a draft, and revise it.
4. Have someone read your draft, and consider their suggestions.
5. Revise your draft again, checking formatting and for spelling or grammatical errors.
6. Turn your final draft in on time!

Please staple these items together in this order:

- a. Final draft of paper
- b. Article
- c. This rubric – It's fine if you have made marks on here to check things off; I'll just make even more marks!

Rubric for Response Paper, Biol-1, revised Fall 2014	Possible	Score
<p>Your response to the article:</p> <p>20: Exceptional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper articulates the main ideas clearly and demonstrates an unusually clear grasp of the ideas presented. • It contains a novel idea, interpretation, or style of presentation. • The personal perspective presented is remarkably mature. <p>18: Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper shows some originality of interpretation, and articulates its main ideas clearly. • The development is concrete and specific and the evidence is appropriate. • The writing shows a clear grasp of the ideas and issues expressed in the reading. <p>16: Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper articulates main ideas, though the organization and development may be lacking in one or more respects. • The essay shows a reasonable grasp of the issues expressed in the reading. <p>14: Adequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper articulates a main idea or ideas, but the development is general and superficial. • There is only a superficial grasp of the ideas and issues presented in the reading. <p>12: Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are significant problems with the expression and development of ideas. • There is little or no examination of ideas and issues presented by the reading. <p>Less than 12: Unacceptable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper is incoherent, does not address the topic in a recognizable way, or does not follow the prescribed format requirements. 	20	
<p>Grammar, spelling, sentence structure: <i>4 = impeccable</i> <i>2 = few errors</i> <i>0 = many errors, posing obstacles to comprehension</i></p>	4	
<p>Citation: Complete in final draft (typed, not just on printed article), proper format</p>	2	
<p>Format: No longer than 1 page, typed, margins at least 0.75", at least 11 point font, double-spaced</p>	2	
<p>Article: Complete, readable hard-copy stapled behind your final draft (This will probably be worn and marked by now, from your many readings!)</p>	2	
<p>Total</p>	30	