

ADI Investigation Report Peer Review Guide - Undergraduate Version

Report By: _____
ID Number

Author: Did the reviewers do a good job?

1 2 3 4 5
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			Teacher Score		
1. Did the author provide a context for the study?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2	
2. Did the author provide enough background information about the phenomenon being studied?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2	
3. Is the background information accurate ?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2	
4. Did the author make the guiding question explicit and explain how the guiding question is related to the background information?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2	
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>						
Section 2: Method		Reviewer Rating			Teacher Score		
1. Did the author describe the procedure he/she used to gather data and then explain why he/she used this procedure?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2	
2. Did the author explain what data were collected (or used) during the investigation and why they were collected (or used)?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2	
3. Did the author describe how he/she analyzed the data and explain why the analysis helped him/her answer the guiding question?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2	
4. Did the author use the correct term to describe his/her investigation (e.g., experiment, observations, interpretation of a data set)?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2	
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>						
Section 3: The Argument		Reviewer Rating			Teacher Score		
1. Did the author provide a claim that answers the guiding question?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2	
2. Did the author include high quality evidence in his/her argument?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Were the data collected in an appropriate manner? ▪ Is the analysis of the data appropriate and free from errors? ▪ Is the author’s interpretation of the analysis (what it means) valid? 	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2	
3. Did the author present the evidence in an appropriate manner by:	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ using a correctly formatted and labeled graph (or table); ▪ including correct metric units (e.g., m/s, g, ml, etc.); and, ▪ referencing the graph or table in the body of the text? 	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2	

Section 3: The Argument (continued)		Reviewer Rating			Teacher Score		
4.	Is the claim consistent with the evidence ?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2
5.	Did the author include a justification of the evidence that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ explains why the evidence is important (why it matters) and ▪ defends the inclusion of the evidence with a specific science concept or by discussing his/her underlying assumptions? 	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2
6.	Is the justification of the evidence acceptable?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2
7.	Did the author discuss how well his/her claim agrees with the claims made by other groups and explain any disagreements?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2
8.	Did the author use scientific terms correctly (e.g., <i>hypothesis</i> vs. <i>prediction</i> , <i>data</i> vs. <i>evidence</i>) and reference the evidence in an appropriate manner (e.g., <i>supports</i> or <i>suggests</i> vs. <i>proves</i>)?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 4: Limitations and Implications		Reviewer Rating			Teacher Score		
1.	Did the author discuss the limitations of the study and what he/she could have done in order to increase the rigor of the investigation?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2
2.	Did the author discuss sources of error that were unavoidable in the collection of the data?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2
3.	Did the author discuss new questions to explore?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> 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			Teacher Score		
1.	Organization: Is each section easy to follow? Do paragraphs include multiple sentences? Do paragraphs begin with a topic sentence?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2
2.	Grammar: Are the sentences complete? Is there proper subject-verb agreement in each sentence? No run-on sentences.	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2
3.	Conventions: Did the author use appropriate spelling, punctuation, paragraphing and capitalization?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2
4.	Word Choice: Did the author use the appropriate word (e.g., there vs. their, to vs. too, than vs. then, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	0	1	2

Total: _____/56