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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 20 1 20 1 20 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 20 1 20 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 20 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 20 1 20 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