

Author of paper being reviewed:

Research Paper Peer-Edit checklist

Peer Editor:

Title of Paper:

First read the entire rough draft, to get an overall impression of the writer's work. Then, go back and evaluate the rough draft to see if the writer has covered the required information sufficiently. Finally, answer the following questions to effectively assist your fellow student in preparing their final research paper. Use the space provided to make notes, then type up your responses in a paper (essay format), using appropriate headings.

Introduction: How does the first paragraph introduce both the paper's topic and the writer's approach or general conclusion? Is the first sentence attention-getting and relevant to the topic?

What can you identify as a thesis statement? Suggest, if possible, a way to improve the introduction or thesis statement.

Structure: Can you identify the organization of the paper from the main idea of each paragraph? What are the main concepts explored in the paper? Does each paragraph make a relevant point that is distinct from what has already been covered? What are the main conclusions?

Content

What is the main impression of this draft?

What appears to be the strongest and weakest features of this rough draft?

Is the thesis clearly and prominently stated?

Is the thesis in its present form worth defending, or does it seem too obvious or too implausible? Explain your answer.

The Research

What is the subject/topic/issue being examined?

What is the background of and purpose/mission of this subject/topic/issue or program? Is there anything the writer should add regarding the background or purpose of this subject/topic/issue? Explain what, and how it would enhance this paper.

Is the thesis adequately supported? What points, if any, need further evidence and review?

Are there any limitations or contradictions to the writer's findings/suggestions?

Writing Style and Organization

Is the tone consistently appropriate to the writer's purpose? Explain your answer.

Do the writer's points appear in the most effective order? Explain your answer.

Does the rough draft repeat or contradict itself? If so, explain here, or mark the relevant passages in the rough draft.

Are all the paragraphs fully developed and well organized? Explain your answer.

Are the opening and closing paragraphs effective in arousing curiosity and giving a sense of completion? If not, how could they be improved?

What did the writer learn from this assignment?

Technical considerations

Did the writer use at least 6 sources in the text of this paper? List them:

- a. Interview(s)
- b. Scholarly articles/journals (2 minimum)
- c. Book(s)
- d. Government publications
- e. Other: _____

Did the writer use correct APA/MLA style format for their in-text citations? (Note appropriate page numbers here and mark the citations on the page).

Did the writer paraphrase effectively? Where? (Identify at least 2 good paraphrases; list page number and underline paraphrase on the page)

Are a significant number of expressions erroneous in meaning, tone, spelling, or correctness of usage? Mark examples on the draft, noting page numbers here.

Does the rough draft have an appropriate title? Explain your answer.

Closing Comments

What suggestions do you have to improve the rough draft? (This is especially important in assisting your fellow student in writing their final research paper.)

What questions do you have for the writer after reading and editing their paper?

What are your concluding thoughts about the rough draft?

Clarity/Style: Did you find distracting grammar, punctuation, spelling, or word usage problems? Circle them and identify any patterns or themes you detect. Is the tone of the essay formal? If you find awkward sentences, try to explain why they don't make sense to you.

OVERALL

[evaluate the research paper using the scoring below the description. Circle your answer.]:

Consistently used a wide range of terminology effectively.

Circle:

1 Missing	2 Needs to improve	3 Average	4 Good	5 Does not need to change a thing
--------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------	---

Demonstrated excellent knowledge and understanding of context and concepts through thorough, accurate descriptions, explanations and examples.

Circle:

1 Missing	2 Needs to improve	3 Average	4 Good	5 Does not need to change a thing
--------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------	---

Formulated a clear and focused research question, thoroughly justifying its relevance with appropriate evidence.

Circle:

1 Missing	2 Needs to improve	3 Average	4 Good	5 Does not need to change a thing
--------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------	---

Formulated and effectively followed a comprehensive action plan to investigate a research question.

Circle:

1 Missing	2 Needs to improve	3 Average	4 Good	5 Does not need to change a thing
--------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------	---

Used research methods to collect and record appropriate, varied, and relevant information.

Circle:

1 Missing	2 Needs to improve	3 Average	4 Good	5 Does not need to change a thing
--------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------	---

Thoroughly evaluated the investigation process and results.

Circle:

1 Missing	2 Needs to improve	3 Average	4 Good	5 Does not need to change a thing
--------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------	---

Communicated information and ideas effectively and accurately by using a style that is completely appropriate to the audience and purpose.

Circle:

1 Missing	2 Needs to improve	3 Average	4 Good	5 Does not need to change a thing
--------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------	---

Structured information and ideas in a way this completely appropriate to the specified format.

Circle:

1 Missing	2 Needs to improve	3 Average	4 Good	5 Does not need to change a thing
--------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------	---

Consistently documented sources of information using a recognized convention.

Circle:

1 Missing	2 Needs to improve	3 Average	4 Good	5 Does not need to change a thing
--------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------	---

Completed a detailed discussion of concepts, issues, models, visual representation and theories.

Circle:

1 Missing	2 Needs to improve	3 Average	4 Good	5 Does not need to change a thing
--------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------	---

Synthesized information to make valid, well-supported arguments.

Circle:

1 Missing	2 Needs to improve	3 Average	4 Good	5 Does not need to change a thing
--------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------	---

Effectively analyzed and evaluated a arrange of sources/data in terms of origin and purpose, consistently recognizing value and limitations.

Circle:

1 Missing	2 Needs to improve	3 Average	4 Good	5 Does not need to change a thing
--------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------	---

Thoroughly interpreted a range of different perspectives and their implications.

Circle:

1 Missing	2 Needs to improve	3 Average	4 Good	5 Does not need to change a thing
--------------	-----------------------	--------------	-----------	---