

PEER WRITING EVALUATIONS

1. First Impression – Read it through once before evaluating
2. Choose at least two passages that you felt were well written and discuss in the Comments section.
3. Choose at least two passages that you would like to see revised further. Give suggestions for revisions in the Comments section.
4. Overall feel of the paper. (See Below)

For the Author and the Reviewer to Consider:

Organization: Did all the paragraphs seem to flow and have a logical order to them? Did each sentence relate to the one that preceded it? Did the topic sentence introduce the material effectively? Did the last sentence of the paragraph effectively summarize the material or somehow lead into the information found in the next paragraph?

Quality of Thinking: Is the subject matter complex in nature? Has the author made a serious attempt to shed new light or offer interesting perspectives on the given subject?

Style and Technique: Has the author effectively integrated expertise into the paper? Is the author's own voice also present and compliment the "expert" voice? Are the word choices concise and clear or are some areas wordy or did the author use odd words/phrases?

Use of Conventions: Has the author integrated quotes using correct citations and proper grammar? Is the Works Cited page correct? Do errors in the paper impede readability?

PEER REVIEW WRITING RUBRIC

	Below Expectation	Approaching Competency	Competent	Proficient
1. Content – What did the author include in their paper? Did it cover all of what was called for in the assignment? Did they stick to the subject? Did they offer evidence to support their statements?	Purpose and main ideas: clear, focused and interesting Supporting details: • Relevant, carefully selected details • Makes connections and shares insights	Purpose and main ideas: unclear and require inferences by reader Supporting details: • Minimal development; insufficient details • Irrelevant details • Extensive repetition	Purpose and main ideas: clear and focused Supporting details: • General or limited in places • Some connections and insights are present	Purpose and main ideas: overly broad or simplistic Supporting details: • Limited, off topic, predictable or too general • Connections and insights are missing
2. Formatting – Is the paper neat? Does it follow the formatting guidelines in the syllabus? Is it obvious that the paper <i>wasn't</i> proofread for minor errors? Citations? Bibliography?	Errors in margins/spacing/justification/citation. Missing bibliography. Does not conform to syllabus guidelines. Missing bibliography is an automatic zero for the paper as a whole.	Errors in margins/ spacing/ justification/citation/ bibliography. Conforms to few of the syllabus guidelines.	Neat, but with an occasional citation error. Conforms to most of the syllabus guidelines.	Neat and nearly error free which reflects clear understanding and thorough proofreading. Conforms to syllabus guidelines.
3. Organization – Is the information presented in logical order or do you feel that the author “jumps around” and you find yourself confused at times?	Organizational structure is unclear and difficult to follow, or too short to demonstrate organization.	Overall structure is inconsistent or skeletal	Organization is clear; order and structure are present.	Order and structure are strong and move the reader through the text.

4. Grammar – Do the sentences make sense? Is the punctuation correct? Are there odd capitalizations and missing commas and periods?	Frequent errors impede readability. • Many end of - sentence punctuation errors; internal punctuation contains frequent errors. • Spelling errors frequently distract the reader; misspelling of common words often occurs. • Capitalization that is inconsistent or often incorrect. • Extensive need for editing.	Errors begin to impede readability. • Some control over basic conventions; text is too simple or too short to reveal proficiency. • End of sentence punctuation is usually correct; however, internal punctuation contains frequent errors. • Spelling errors that distract the reader. • Capitalization errors. • Significant need for editing.	Minor errors do not impede readability. • Control over conventions used, although a wide range is not demonstrated. • Correct end of sentence punctuation; internal punctuation is sometimes incorrect. • Moderate need for editing.	Errors are few and minor. • Correct grammar and usage that contribute to clarity and style. • Skill in using a wide range of conventions. • Little need for editing.
5. Fluency – Are you able to get through the paper easily or do you often stop because something didn't make sense?	Writing tends to either be choppy, rambling or incomplete. Awkward constructions force the reader to slow down or reread. • Sentence beginnings: begin the same way. • Sentence lengths: same lengths either short and choppy or long and rambling. • Sentence patterns: repeated over and over. (e.g., subject verb or subject verb object). • Sentence structure that obscures meaning. • Confusing word order. • Text is too short to demonstrate variety and control.	Some parts are easy to read aloud; occasional awkward constructions force the reader to slow down. • Sentence beginnings: many sentences begin the same way. • Sentence lengths: many sentences are the same length. • Sentence patterns: many are the same. Little control over more complex sentences.	Writing is easy to read aloud; sounds natural; variety of sentence beginnings, lengths and patterns. • Sentence beginnings: most sentences begin in different ways. Some repetition detracts from overall impact. • Sentence lengths: some sentences are shorter; some are longer. Some repetition detracts from overall impact. • Sentence patterns: somewhat varied. Some control over more complex sentences.	Writing has an easy flow and rhythm. Sentences are carefully crafted, with strong and varied structure. • Sentence beginnings: sentences begin in different ways, adding interest. • Sentence lengths: a variety of lengths that add interest. • Sentence patterns: a variety of complex patterns that add interest.
Comments:				