	Below expectations	Meets expectations	Above expectations *Meets expectations plus:*
Pre-discussion questions	- Yes/no or other short answers -Disconnected from the reading	- Open-ended and encourage discussion -Designed to move towards a deeper understanding of the reading -Directly connected to the reading	-Questions encourage making connections to broader topics and other examples
Content: Methods	-No clarification of methods	-Discuss what the authors did and why -Any confusing points clarified	-Considers the approaches and what specific question each of them answered
Content: Results	-Discussed only generally -Or, each result discussed in isolation	-Summarizes main findings -Specific results discussed in the context of the overall question -Driven by interpretation of the figures	-Connects results to the methods and to the discussion and major findings
Content: Overall	-Does not identify main question -Major findings unclear	-Clearly identifies central question/goal of paper -Discusses major findings -Why do we care?	-Places central question and major findings in the context of the broader field
Leading	-Dominates the discussion, or lets it die for more than a minute or two -Does not include all students	-Many voices are heard, with multiple viewpoints -Tries to engage all participants -Asks follow-up questions and summarizes important points	-Uses creative methods for encouraging participation and engagement -Elicits discussion that includes the important points

Good job! A few notes:

I liked the way you started with defining the relevant terms. That was a good way to both get everyone talking, and to make sure everyone was on the same page.

After that, you dived right into types of genetic mechanisms. I thought it was great that you incuded a summary of the previous knowledge going into the study. After that you pretty much skipped talking about the overall questions motivating each paper, just diving into the methods.

You did a good job guiding the discussion to interpret the results and focus on the figures, but again it would have been more helpful with more context of the questions the authors were trying to answer. Also by connecting the results more; you talked about each result largely in isolation, rather than what the authors learned from all of them together.

A suggestion on leading: there were times when you didn't get rapid answers to your questions (happens to everyone sometimes); generally, you ended up answering the questions yourselves. It's a bit tricky to think on your feet sometimes, but if you can find a way to re-phrase or break down a question, or give people a chance to think it through on their own, you might increase participation a bit.

You were clearly well-prepared, and did a good job sharing the responsibilities of leading. You did a great job of helping everyone understand the what the authors did and specific results; overall, though, it could have been improved by giving more contexts for those methods and results, especially by highlighting the major questions asked in the paper, and why the authors cared.

17/20