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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Report By:** |  | | | **Author:** Did the reviewers do a good job? | | | 1 2 3 4 5 | |
|  | ID Number | | |  | | | Rate the overall quality of the peer review | |
| **Reviewed By:** |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |
|  | ID Number |  | ID Number | |  | ID Number |  | ID Number |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 1: Introduction and Guiding Question** | | Reviewer Rating | | | Instructor Score |
| 1. Did the author provide enough ***background information*** about the *concept, theory, law, or model* underlying the investigation? | | 🞏 No | 🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes | 0 1 2 |
| 1. Did the author ***describe the goal*** of the study? | | 🞏 No | 🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes | 0 1 2 |
| 1. Did the author make the ***guiding question*** explicit and explain how the guiding question is related to the background information? | | 🞏 No | 🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes | 0 1 2 |
| **Reviewers:** If your group made any “No” or “Partially” marks in this section, please **explain how the author could improve** this part of his or her report. | **Author:** What revisions did you make in your report? Is there anything you decided to keep the same even though the reviewers suggested otherwise? Be sure to explain why. | | | | |
| **Section 2: Method** | | Reviewer Rating | | | Instructor Score |
| 1. Did the author describe ***the method*** he/she used to gather data and explain how the method helped him/her answer the guiding question? | | 🞏 No | 🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes | 0 1 2 |
| 1. Did the author describe ***the type of data*** (quantitative or qualitative) that he or she collected and why that type of data was collected? | | 🞏 No | 🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes | 0 1 2 |
| 1. Did the author describe ***how*** he or she ***analyzed the data*** and explain why the analysis helped him/her answer the guiding question? | | 🞏 No | 🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes | 0 1 2 |
| 1. Did the author use the ***correct term*** to describe his/her investigation (i.e., experiment, systematic observation, interpretation of a data set)? | | 🞏 No | 🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes | 0 1 2 |
| **Reviewers:** If your group made any “No” or “Partially” marks in this section, please **explain how the author could improve** this part of his or her report. | **Author:** What revisions did you make in your report? Is there anything you decided to keep the same even though the reviewers suggested otherwise? Be sure to explain why. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 3: The Argument** | | Reviewer Rating | | | Instructor Score |
| 1. Did the author include a ***claim*** that provides a validanswer to the guiding question? | | 🞏 No | 🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes | 0 1 2 |
| 1. Did the author support his or her claim with ***evidence***(analyzed data and an interpretation of the analysis)? | | 🞏 No | 🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes | 0 1 2 |
| 1. Does the author have ***high quality evidence***?  * Were sources of measurement error explained? * Was the analysis of the data appropriate and free from errors? * Was the author’s interpretation of the analysis valid? * Is there enough evidence to support the claim? | | 🞏 No  🞏 No  🞏 No  🞏 No | 🞏 Partially  🞏 Partially  🞏 Partially  🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes  🞏 Yes  🞏 Yes  🞏 Yes | 0 1 2  0 1 2  0 1 2  0 1 2 |
| 1. Did the author ***present the evidence*** in an appropriate manner by***:***    * Including a correctly formatted and labeled graph (or table);    * Using correct metric units (e.g., m/s, g, ml, etc.); and,    * Referencing the graph or table in the body of the text? | | 🞏 No  🞏 No  🞏 No | 🞏 Partially  🞏 Partially  🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes  🞏 Yes  🞏 Yes | 0 1 2  0 1 2  0 1 2 |
| 1. Did the author include a ***justification of the evidence*** that:  * Explains why the evidence is important? * Defends the inclusion of the evidence with a specific science concept or by discussing an underlying assumption? | | 🞏 No  🞏 No | 🞏 Partially  🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes  🞏 Yes | 0 1 2  0 1 2 |
| 1. Did the author ***discuss the arguments made by other groups*** by:  * Describing some of the claims made by other groups? * Describing how well the other claims align with his or her claim? * Critiquing the evidence provided for the other claims? | | 🞏 No  🞏 No  🞏 No | 🞏 Partially  🞏 Partially  🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes  🞏 Yes  🞏 Yes | 0 1 2  0 1 2  0 1 2 |
| 1. Did the author use scientific ***terms*** (hypothesis vs. prediction, data vs. evidence) and ***phrases*** (supports vs. proves) correctly? | | 🞏 No | 🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes | 0 1 2 |
| **Reviewers:** If your group made any “No” or “Partially” marks in this section, please **explain how the author could improve** this part of his or her report. | **Author:** What revisions did you make in your report? Is there anything you decided to keep the same even though the reviewers suggested otherwise? Be sure to explain why. | | | | |
| **Mechanics** | | Reviewer Rating | | | Instructor Score |
| 1. ***Organization:*** Is each section easy to follow? Do paragraphs include multiple sentences? Do paragraphs begin with a topic sentence? | | 🞏 No | 🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes | 0 1 2 |
| 1. ***Grammar:*** Are the sentences complete? Is there proper subject-verb agreement in each sentence? No run-on sentences. | | 🞏 No | 🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes | 0 1 2 |
| 1. ***Conventions:*** Did the author use appropriate spelling, punctuation, paragraphing and capitalization? | | 🞏 No | 🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes | 0 1 2 |
| 1. ***Word Choice:*** Did the author use the appropriate word (there vs. their, to vs. too, etc.) | | 🞏 No | 🞏 Partially | 🞏 Yes | 0 1 2 |
| Instructor Comments: | | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Was the investigation rigorous and appropriate given the nature of the guiding question? | | | | | 0 1 2 |

Total: /54