Historical Investigation: Section 2 Peer Review

Peer Editor:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Give this paper to the student reviewing your paper. They will write their notes about your paper here.*

On student paper, peer reviewer needs to:

* Read through and make appropriate notes/comments
  + Spelling/grammar mistakes
  + Are there parts that are unclear or do not make sense?

Check List:

\_\_\_\_\_ 4-5-paragraphs (Conclusion last paragraph)

\_\_\_\_\_In-text citations in every paragraph except for the conclusion

\_\_\_\_\_4 Sources

Guiding Questions:

1. What is their HI question?
2. What are the main ideas/topics for each body paragraph?
3. What is their answer to the HI question?
4. Are they using plenty of evidence to back up their answer? Explain
5. How many print sources do they use?
6. Are their sources appropriate? Do they have a variety of different sources? Explain
7. Are there correctly-formatted in-text citations for all outside information? If not make corrections on their paper.
8. Is there a correctly-formatted reference list/bibliography?
   1. Alphabetical
   2. Format (indented appropriately)
   3. MLA format
9. Do they connect the evidence to their analysis?
10. Is there plenty of analysis (should be 50:50)? Does it make sense? Is it related to their question? Explain
11. Are there a lot of grammatical mistakes? Does it make it difficult to understand/read? (Mark on paper mistakes you notice)
12. Anything else you think the paper needs? General Comments?

**Rubric Section 2: Investigation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A | * Contains well developed critical analysis that is focused clearly on the stated question (50:50). * Uses **evidence** from a range of sources **(4 total, at least 3 print)** that supports their argument. * Investigation argues to *a reasoned conclusion* that is *consistent with the evidence* and arguments provided. |
| B | * Contains critical analysis, but may lack development or clarity. * Uses **evidence** from a range of sources is used to support the argument **(At least 3 print).** * Investigation argues to a *reasoned conclusion*. * Investigation is *clear, coherent and effectively organized*. |
| C | * Investigation moves beyond description to include some analysis, but it is not sustained (75:25). * Uses **evidence** to support the argument **(at least 2 print)** * Investigation is *generally clear and well organized*, but there may be some repetition or lack of clarity in places. |
| D | * The investigation contains some limited critical analysis, but is primarily narrative/descriptive in nature. * **Evidence** from sources is included but are **limited** **(only 1 print)** * *Attempt to organize the investigation* but it lacks clarity and coherence. |
| F | * Investigation contains little or no critical analysis. * Reference is made to **evidence** from sources, but there is no analysis of that evidence. * There *is minimal focus on the task* (does not answer their HI question) |