

Lab Report Scoring Rubric

Criteria	Level			
	0 pt	Poor (1 pt)	Fair (2 pts)	Good (3 pts)
Section 1: What were you trying to explain and why?				
1. The author describes the underlying concept and its importance in science.	No discussion of concept.	The concept is defined, but not explored in terms of its meaning within the scientific community.	The concept is defined and discussed briefly in terms of its meaning within the scientific community.	The concept is defined and fully discussed in terms of its meaning within the scientific community.
2. The author clearly relates the research question and goals of the investigation to the concept.	Research question is not stated.	The specific problem under investigation is stated, but not related to the concept.	The specific problem under investigation is stated and briefly discussed in terms of the concept.	The specific problem under investigation is discussed; its relationship to the concept is discussed in detail.
Section 2: How did you go about your work and why?				
1. The author provides an adequate description of how the investigation was done, including measures taken to reduce error.	The method is not described.	The author provides partial description of the method.	The author provides adequate description of how the investigation was done but insufficient information on techniques employed to reduce error.	The author provides adequate description of how the investigation was done including appropriate methods to reduce experimental error.
2. The author provides a meaningful rationale for why the experiment was done in this manner.	No rationale for the method.	The author provides minimal or partial rationale for the experiment.	The author provides good rationale for some aspects of the experiment but not all.	The author provides rationale for all aspects of the experiment.
Section 3: The Argument				
1. The author provides a sufficient answer to the research question.	Question not answered.	Brief answer to the question that lacks detail.	Detailed answer to the question.	Detailed answer to the question that also relates the answer to the concept.
2. The author provides valid and reliable data and presents the data in an organized format.	No data presented.	The author presents insufficient data or data is unorganized.	The author presents sufficient data in an organized chart but labels, units, and/or significant figures are missing or incorrect.	The author presents sufficient data in an organized chart with correct labels, units, and significant figures.
3. The author uses the experimental data as evidence to support his/her claim.	Does not support claim with evidence.	The author provides support but used evidence based on unreliable or invalid data.	The author provides support for all of his/her ideas using valid and reliable data BUT uses only some of data.	The author provides support for all of his/her ideas using valid and reliable data AND uses most of the data.
4. The author provides a rationale that explains why the evidence is relevant and why the evidence supports the claim.	No rationale provided.	The rationale does not support the claim.	The author only explains why the evidence is relevant OR why the evidence supports the claim, but not both.	The author explains why the evidence is relevant AND why the evidence supports the claim.
5. The author's claim is consistent with known values and/or with other groups in his/her lab section.	No comparison and conclusion was inaccurate.	The conclusion is correct, but no comparison with other groups was included.	The conclusion is partially correct, but comparison with other groups was used to explain error in values.	The conclusion is correct and the values were compared in a meaningful way with the values of the other groups or with known values.
The Writing				
1. Organization and Sentence Fluency. The writing has a sense of purpose and structure.	Not Applicable	The writing lacks coherence and organization. The writing is difficult to follow. Sentences tend to be incomplete, rambling, or very awkward.	The overall structure of the report is inconsistent or skeletal. Occasional awkward sentence constructions may force the reader to slow down or reread.	The organization of the writing enhances the central idea and its development. The writing has an easy flow and rhythm.
2. Word Choice. The author used appropriate words to express his or her ideas.	Not Applicable	The writing includes many misused words and/or phrases not used in scientific report, such as "it is proven" or "it's correct."	The writing includes a variety of generic words with no inappropriate phrases. One to two instances of misused terminology.	The writing includes a broad range of words that have been carefully chosen. All terminology is correctly used.
3. Conventions. The author used appropriate grammar, spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, capitalization and formatting (superscripts and subscripts).	Not Applicable	The author made multiple technical writing errors.	The author made two or three technical writing errors.	The author used appropriate grammar, spelling, punctuation, paragraphing, capitalization and formatting.