Engineering 0012 • Freshman Conference • Peer Review • Spring 2016

Peer Review Instructions:
In every professional conference, there is a peer review phase in the paper submission process. The purpose of the peer review is twofold: 1) Have experts in the area review the paper to assure the technical accuracy of the material presented, 2) Have experts in the field provide feedback on the paper content to help improve the quality of the paper.

Your task is to perform a review of a fellow student’s paper. A paper number will be assigned to you for peer review. Download the paper assigned to you for review. Read the paper, making notes and suggestions on the paper as well as in all categories on the form. You will submit both this form and the paper you reviewed in class on the Tuesday after Spring Break. You will submit both the paper you have reviewed and the completed Peer Review Form in hard copy in your Engineering 0012 classes on Tuesday, March 18.

On the Peer Review Form, check Excellent, Good, Acceptable, or Serious Problems for each category, and briefly note the nature of any problems. Make any other notes, on the form and on the paper, that might be useful to the authors. When you are done put your name on the last page.

Note your name will be cut off the paper before it is returned to the author, so they will not know who did the review. (Note, do not print this form out on 2-sided). The grade you receive on this assignment will be based on the quality of your review. Put the authors names and the session number that the paper is located in on the form.

AUTHORS________________________________________ Session _______

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATION
Format: □ Excellent □ Good □ Acceptable □ Serious Problems
Does the paper follow all formatting specifications? On the paper, note any formatting errors with by writing “form” near the error

Grammar, Punctuation: □ Excellent □ Good □ Acceptable □ Serious Problems
Are grammar and punctuation consistently correct throughout the paper? On the paper, mark any grammar problems “g”; mark any punctuation problems “p.”

Proofreading: □ Excellent □ Good □ Acceptable □ Serious Problems
Does the paper appear to have been carefully proofread prior to submission? On the paper, mark proofreading errors (‘typos,” misspelled words, missed words, words that are correctly spelled but used incorrectly, etc.) “pf.”

CONTENT
Focus: □ Excellent □ Good □ Acceptable □ Serious Problems
Has the central topic/focus of the paper been clearly articulated? If so, please state, here, what the topic/focus is. If not, mark a place on the paper where the topic or focus should be stated, and suggest an effective articulation of the topic.

Specificity/Support: □ Excellent □ Good □ Acceptable □ Serious Problems
Are all claims made in the paper clearly supported with appropriate data, details, and/or examples? If specificity/support is weak, mark the area of weakness “spec,” and briefly clarify for the authors the types of specificity/support that would improve clarity and impact.
Explanation/Description of Technologies: □ Excellent □ Good □ Acceptable □ Serious Problems
Are technologies fully and clearly described and explained? Are details and examples used effectively to promote clear descriptions of technologies? On the paper, mark areas of weakness in descriptions/explanations of technologies “tech det.” Briefly clarify for the authors what kinds of details/explanations need to be added and integrated for maximum immediate and ongoing clarity.

Arrangement/Logic: □ Excellent □ Good □ Acceptable □ Serious Problems
Are sections placed in logical, effective order? Are all sections relevant to the paper-as-a-whole? On the paper, mark problems with arrangement or logic “arr” or “log.” Briefly describe how the authors could revise to maximize immediate and ongoing logical progression of information.

Connections/Cohesion: □ Excellent □ Good □ Acceptable □ Serious Problems
Are connections within and among sections clearly established and maintained? On the paper, note gaps in connection or cohesion “conn.” Briefly describe what the authors need to do to establish better connections and reinforce cohesion.

Title, Headings, Graphics: □ Excellent □ Good □ Acceptable □ Serious Problems
Does the paper’s title effectively introduce/summarize the paper’s content? Do headings help advance the logic of the paper? Are graphics clearly labeled and logically placed? Are there any irrelevant graphics? On the paper, note any problems with the paper’s title, headings, or graphics. Provide brief suggestions for improvement.

Overall Rating: □ Excellent □ Good □ Acceptable □ Serious Problems
Overall Notes:

Your name: ____________________________  Your login: ____________________________

Circle Section: Sanchez 10 AM  Bursic 2 PM  Mahboobin 4 PM
Mahboobin 10 AM  Vidic 2 PM  Lora 4 PM  Lora 6 PM