"They've Got Folklore" (Comparison of Exhibit Sources) Peer Review

(\*\*) rows are weighted more heavily.

| Author:  | Reviewer: | Yes | Somewhat | No |
|--|-----------|-----|----------|----|
| Is the response properly <b>formatted</b> ? E.g., Does it have a thoughtful title and meet the 3-page double-spaced length requirement? Are sources properly cited?  |           |     |          |    |
| Does the paper include at least 3 primary (exhibit) sources? Do they fall within the scope of the course theme?  |           |     |          |    |
| ** Is <b>useful contextual information</b> about the primary sources clearly and quickly identified?   |           |     |          |    |
| ** Do the examples chosen seem well suited for an in-depth analysis? (number, type, relative similarity or difference, etc.) List each source and evaluate it on the back of the paper.  |           |     |          |    |
| ** Does the paper clearly describe all aspects of the primary sources, offering concrete, specific observations presented with attention to <b>detail</b> ?  |           |     |          |    |
| ** Does the paper avoid simply listing details, instead emphasizing the significance of <b>patterns</b> (exact repetitions, related ideas, striking contrasts, anomalies), that emerge from the texts themselves and with regard to performance contexts?  |           |     |          |    |
| ** Does the response <b>avoid personal reactions</b> to the exhibit texts and/or judgments about the material being explored, instead <b>basing assertions in relevant concrete visual and textual evidence</b> from the primary sources? Is each assertion linked to evidence that supports it? |           |     |          |    |
| ** Does the analysis conclude with <b>focused and specific research questions ("In what ways," "To what extent," "To what degree," "In what situations," "Given X, why Y?")</b> that begin to answer "So What?", and that will direct future research in meaningful ways?                        |           |     |          |    |
| Is the response <b>structured</b> effectively? Are paragraphs, sentences, and words arranged in a <b>logical order with clear transitions</b> , demonstrating that the author composed (rather than dashed off) analysis?  |           |     |          |    |
| Are <b>words used precisely and accurately</b> , rather than employed as a way to puff up the paper or "fill space"?   |           |     |          |    |

1. List the patterns identified by the author.

## Found in assignment:

- Punctuation Mistakes
- Subject/Verb Disagreement
- Passive Voice
- Sentence Fragments
- Run-on Sentences and Comma Splices
- Awkward Wording
- Informal/Colloquial Language
- Vague or Undefined Words
- Misspelled Words

3. Note any additional patterns or examples the author might want to consider.

2. List a claim that needs more evidence.

- Wrong Words
- Accidental Repetition
- Wordiness
- Tense Changes

4. List kudos, suggestions, or additional comments on the back of this sheet.