

Name:							/60
<u>Expt 4 - GC-MS Analysis of Volatile Fragrance Compounds-Rubrics</u>						max	Your score
Rubric		Possible POINTS				60	comment
Data	0	1	2	3			
1	Figure showing GC Total Ion Current trace, for sample 1?	no		yes		2	
2	Figure showing GC Total Ion Current trace, for sample 2?	no		yes		2	
3	GC trace #1: Table of six components	no		yes, printed straight from ChemStation	Formatted in Word, with RT, %, database ID, % match	3	
4	GC trace #2: Table of six components	no		yes, printed straight from ChemStation	Formatted in Word, with RT, %, database ID, % match	3	
5	Mass spectrum #1	no		yes		2	
6	Mass spectrum #2	no		yes		2	
7	Table of m/m+1/m+2 intensities (1 for ea spectrum)	no	yes			1	
8	HC ion 1: Energy/other parameters (place copy of .hin file in publicreports)	no	yes			1	
9	HC ion 2: Energy/other parameters (place copy of .hin file in publicreports)	no	yes			1	
10	Was the report handed in on time?	no		yes		2	
11	When was it handed in?	1 day late		on time		2	
<b>Interpretation</b>							
8	m/m+1/m+2 calculations reports for spec 1	no	yes			2	
9	m/m+1/m+2 calculations reports for spec 2	no	yes			2	
10	Fragmentation mech #1	not reasonable	kinda	reasonable. curved arrows correct		2	
11	Fragmentation mech #2	not reasonable	kinda	reasonable. curved arrows correct		2	
12	Fragmentation mech #3	not reasonable	kinda	reasonable. curved arrows correct		2	
13	Fragmentation mech #4	not reasonable	kinda	reasonable. curved arrows correct		2	
14	Fragmentation mech #5	not reasonable	kinda	reasonable. curved arrows correct		2	
15	Fragmentation mech #6	not reasonable	kinda	reasonable. curved arrows correct		2	
16	Mention made of the HC structures related to fragmentation reaction?	no		One	yes, both	3	
<b>Writing style</b>							
17	Are there misspelled words, run-on or fragmentary sentences, one-sentence paragraphs, colloquialisms, or jargon terms occurring in the report?	lots		1 or 2	zero	3	
18	In the Experimental Section, is the procedure described with proper amount of detail? I.e. not too wordy but enough so that a good chemistry student would get essentially the same results.	Way too short	Told about the Pasteur pipets, how long they were, and other unnecessary details.	good		2	

19	By and large, are paragraphs well organized and focused on a topic signaled in the first sentence?	rarely			mostly	3		
20	How many (legitimate) ungrammatical hits (agreement in number, etc) are picked up in Word grammar checker?	lots			zero or one	3		
<b>Figures</b>								
21	To what extent are the spectra figures clear enough to see the important features?	no figures	way too small and dim		big, clear, and profusely illustrated	3		
22	Are the molecular formulas the work of the author, or some other person who is or is not acknowledged?	All "borrowed" from another student		One or more borrowed.	By author with ChemSketch etc	3		
<b>Acknowledgements</b>								
23	Are the roles of lab partners spelled out?	no		yes		2		
<b>References</b>								
24	Are references listed under the correct heading, in the correct format (J. Org. Chem.), and are they (or is it) accompanied by in-text reference # ?	no	yes			1		