EVS185. Fall 2015. Peer-evaluation of the second draft of the seminar paper.

Paper author: Reader: Read your colleague's essay and provide feedback using the rubric below. Be fair and honest in your feedback. Being falsely nice won't be helpful to your colleague because it will deprive him or her from the critical feedback he or she is looking for. Evaluate each item on the rubric using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Poor	Needs	Needs	Good, Needs	Very Good
	Extensive Work	Improvement	Fine Tuning	

Introduction

(circle a number)

4

4

5

5

5

The introduction

- is about 1/2 page long 2 3 states the topic 2 3 defines the key concepts 2 3 1
- 4 very briefly states what the two articles argue (about one sentence for each)
- 2 3 4 5 1
- previews how the arguments relate to a theory discussed in class 1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

Summary

- defines additional concepts, if necessary, or key concepts in depth (if necessary)
- presents the arguments of both articles
- 5 2 describes evidence supporting the arguments (not all evidence, just the most important) 1 2 3 4 5
- the facts about the two articles are integrated, information is not presented in two unrelated blocks 5
- the summary is about 1.5 page long
- Comments:

3 5 1

3

3

4

4

5

1

1

2

Critical analysis

- For each critical point (a "critical point" can discuss either what the authors of the journal article is doing correctly or what they are not doing correctly)
- argument is clearly presented
- argument is supported
- there is at least one critical point for each article
- the analysis is about 1.5 page long

Comments:

	\overline{c}		5)	
1_	2	3	4	_5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5

Conclusion - is about 1/2 long 1_2_3_4_5 - summarizes the arguments and the critical discussion 1_2_3_4_5 - discusses how the articles relate to a theory discussed in class 1_2_3_4_5 Comments: