**GEOG 300 week 7 recitation: *CT 2 Peer-review ACTIVITY***

Your name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Recitation time: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ TA Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Group name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

# INSTRUCTIONS

As a group, you will be reviewing one another’s drafts of Critical Thinking (CT) Paper 2. The goal is to ensure that no one in your group earns a zero. Papers failing to meet the requirements in the colored sections with the arrows (🡪) will result in a score of zero.

Your paper will be checked by two group members for each part. If no members of your group earn a zero on CT 2, all group members who participated in this recitation activity will earn 5 bonus percentage points.

# PART 1

**🡪 Paper is written using required format.** Did the author use all the correct sub-headings and are the sections written in the required order? Is all the required information included in the header?

**🡪 Paper is written on the correct topic.** Does the question number correspond with the author’s penultimate (second to last) digit of their student ID number?

**Word count.** Is the total word count of the CT paper between 500 and 550 words? Is the *Analysis* section word count between 400 and 450 words? If the answer to either question is “No,” let the author know how many points they should expect to lose for going over/under the required word counts.

**🡪 In-text citations.** Check *every* in-text citation and make sure they all follow the *required* format for in-text citations: (Author(s) last name(s) publication year, page#). Moreover, verify that all the sources cited in the text are also listed in the Bibliography (and vice-versa).

# PART 2

**Bibliography.** Do all sources adhere to the *required* APA format? Are these sources listed in alphabetical order? **🡪 Use of acceptable sources**. Did the author cite a minimum of four relevant peer-reviewed sources published in the last ten years? Use your computer to verify the quality of their primary sources. *If a source looks questionable, please make a note of this to the author.*

# PART 3

**Content.** The two reviewers of each paper will want to use a different colored pen to write in comments and provide feedback to the author of the paper under review.

Reviewers, as you read your peers’ papers, think about the following: Are their argument and position clear? Does the evidence presented support their thesis statement? Is the paper well organized? Is it written concisely? Write in your final thoughts for each section (strengths/weaknesses/ suggested changes) on the appropriate spaces provided on the back side of this paper.

**Name of 1st reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Color of pen used: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Title.** Is it reflective of the topic/position on the issue?

**Interpretation.** Is position/thesis statement clear, direct, and specific? Are supporting claims introduced?

**Analysis.** Are thoughts well-organized? Does paper provide relevant *facts* to support arguments presented?

**Evaluation.** Were *two* of the *primary* sources evaluated? What are your thoughts on these evaluations?

**Inference.** Did the author clearly identify the broader consequences of the specific issue discussed in this paper?

**Explanation.** Is this an appropriate conclusion? Does it reinforce the position presented in the thesis statement? Is it supported by facts from the Analysis?

**Name of 2nd reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Color of pen used: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Title.** Is it reflective of the topic/position on the issue?

**Interpretation.** Is position/thesis statement clear, direct, and specific? Are supporting claims introduced?

**Analysis.** Are thoughts well-organized? Does paper provide relevant *facts* to support arguments presented?

**Evaluation.** Were *two* of the *primary* sources evaluated? What are your thoughts on these evaluations?

**Inference.** Did the author clearly identify the broader consequences of the specific issue discussed in this paper?

**Explanation.** Is this an appropriate conclusion? Does it reinforce the position presented in the thesis statement? Is it supported by facts from the Analysis?