

Peer Review Guidelines *(updated 10.10.22)*

“Some empirical evidence has shown that if students get focused feedback from peers, their revisions are better than those students who received feedback from their professors only” (Ambrose, Bridges, DiPietro, Lovett, & Norman, 2010, p. 257)

Complete the following 4 steps (A - D) for each paper.

A. Review the guidelines for this assignment on the course website:

Elements needed in a typical literature review:

Part #1 (length varies):

(1) **Initial Synthesis** of Theory and Literature, (2) **Questions** Guiding your research (or literature review), (3) **Organization** of the paper. See more information in the link to the guidelines above.

Part #2 (less than a page):

(4) **Need** for the literature review (or research study), (5) **Purpose** of the literature review (or research study),

Method: For a literature review, identify your (6) **Sources**; (7) **Criteria for inclusion and exclusion**.

NOTE: If you were doing a research paper this is where you would outline your **research context, methods of sample selection, data collection** and **data analysis**. You would provide a rationale for each of these based on your research questions, such as why are your methods of data collection appropriate given the questions you are asking?

Results: For a literature review, present your (8) **Critical review and synthesis** – Critically review the identified studies in your sample, grouping them by theme. Synthesize themes in the *findings* and *methods*;

NOTE: If you are doing a research paper this is where you would present the findings in answer to each research question.

(9) **Limitations**

NOTE: If you are doing a research paper, here you would write out what you expect to find and why. You would also write out the limitations of your research design.

Discussion & Conclusions:

(10) **Summary** of what was reviewed (or studied) and why;

(11) **Scholarly significance** of themes in the findings and methods;

NOTE: For a research paper, discuss the significance of the results in light of the prior research and theory. How do you explain the results you found? What was surprising or expected? How do your findings align with or contradict previous related research?

B. Please read the paper through the first time without making any markings on it in order to familiarize yourself with the paper.

C. Read the paper for a second and final time, and address the following areas in your critical review. Use TRACKED CHANGES to indicate missing or unclear elements:

- Are all the **11 elements** above addressed in the paper draft? If not, what's missing?

NOTE: Practitioner pieces or conceptual articles will not typically have methods or results sections.

Use TRACKED CHANGES to indicate missing or unclear elements.

HOW TO MAKE YOUR COMMENTS ANONYMOUS IN TRACKED CHANGES

On a PC:

Edit User Name

1. First and foremost, click "Review" tab.
2. Then click "Track Change" in "Tracking" group.
3. Next, click "Change User Name".
4. Now the "Word Options" dialog box will pop up. Make sure the "General" tab is displayed. Then change the user name and initials.
5. Finally, click "OK".

On a Mac:

Change the name or initials used in a comment

1. On the Word menu, click Preferences.
2. Under Personal Settings, click User Information .
3. In the First, Last, and Initials boxes, type the first name, last name, and initials that you want to use in your comments or make sure these are BLANK.

D. INCLUDE YOUR ASSESSMENT OF THE FOLLOWING REVIEW QUESTIONS:

1) Do the first 2 pages (Part I and 2) situate the study (or literature review) being proposed within the context of a broader interest area and what is already known about the subject?

- Does it explain why this proposed study (or literature review) is needed and why it is important and with sufficient citations?

- Are key terms clearly defined?

YOUR RESPONSE

2) Do the pages describing Methods seem clearly aligned with what has come before or do they seem to come out of nowhere? For a research article, do the proposed methods seem appropriate for addressing the research questions? If not, what suggestions do you have? (For a **literature review**, will the proposed methods identify studies that are relevant to address the questions focusing this review? If not, what suggestions do you have?)

YOUR RESPONSE

3) Does the argument progress clearly from one paragraph to the other (for example, is the sequencing/organization logical)? Does each paragraph add to the main argument or purpose of the proposal? If not, where does the structure break down, go off on a tangent, and/or which paragraph(s) are problematic and why?

YOUR RESPONSE

4) Does the writer support assertions with evidence? Indicate where there are paragraphs with weak evidence, evidence not supporting the argument, and so on.

YOUR RESPONSE

5) Does the conclusion draw together the main points of paper and clearly identify a gap in the research literature? Does the identified gap seem to logically flow from the results? If not, what suggestions do you have?

YOUR RESPONSE

6) Is the writing clear and clearly proofread? If not, indicate spelling, word omissions, awkward phrasing, etc. in your tracked changes.

YOUR RESPONSE

7) What is the BEST part of the paper?

YOUR RESPONSE

8) Which areas of the paper need MOST improvement (e.g., the argument, organization, sentence structure or word choice, evidence)? Be specific so that the writer knows where to focus his or her energy.

YOUR RESPONSE

References

Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M. C., Norman, M. K., & Mayer, R. E. (2010). *How learning works: Seven research-based principles for smart teaching*. New York: Jossey-Bass.