

GEOG 558 – Hazards and Risk Management – peer critique

Colleague's name: _____

Title or subject of review essay: _____

Completeness of review (range: -3 to +2):

Are there at least 10 sources? (yes = +1; no= -1)

1

Are at least 8 from refereed journals? (yes = +1; no= -2)

1

Content analysis (range: 0 to 6):

Do you get a sense that the author has tried to pick out similarities and disagreements among the readings and use those to cluster them into themes? (yes=2; sort of, but not too effectively=1; no=0)

2

Does your colleague look critically at how data and methods are used to judge the effectiveness of each side? (yes=2; sort of, but not too effectively=1; no=0)

2

Does your colleague judge the effectiveness of the articles in a theme? Does your colleague try to rank articles overall or articles within a theme by how effective or convincing they are or how valuable their "takeaway" messages are? (yes=1; no=0)

1

Did you come away with some useful lessons that might be applicable to your own work or to potential culminating projects for your degree? (yes=1; no=0)

1

Conceptual organization (range: 0 to 2)

Is the review organized thematically, addressing roughly three or four themes, bringing in the readings as needed to develop the theme? (yes=2; no – look at the next question)

2

Is the review, instead, organized source by source by source, so that you can't really see the bigger themes in the discussion? (don't answer this if you said yes to the previous question: yes=1; no – look at the next question)

Is the review just a confused mish-mash of "panic prose"? (if you can't pick out a thematic organization or at least an article by article organization, and you are forced to answer this question yes, give your colleague a 0 for this whole section)

Documentation (range: -1 to +3)

Is the reference list organized alphabetically by lead author's family name? (yes=1; no=0) 1

Are the article references formatted exactly correctly, including placement of commas, semi-colons, italicization of journal titles, etc.? (yes=2; mostly=1; no=0) 2

Are any other types of source formatted correctly, too? (it's possible that your colleague used all journal articles, so this question can only have a negative effect if done incorrectly – yes=0; no= -1) 0

Writing mechanics (range: -1 to +7):

Is the paper itself well-organized, so that you always have a sense of where you are and how the ideas lead from one to another? (very well organized=2; organized for the most part but a little disjointed in places so that it's hard to follow the argument sometimes=1; disorganized, stream-of-consciousness=0) 2

Are there any misspellings or typos? (virtually perfect spelling, with no more than two typos=2; mostly okay, but there are a few typos and misspellings=1; wholesale spelling gaffes=0) 2

Are there any grammatical errors? (always grammatical=1; ungrammatical, with subject-verb disagreements or inexplicable tense changes=0) 1

Are the sentences correctly built and varied in structure, so that it's not dull and repetitive to read? (yes=1; poorly structured sentences, with lots of incomplete sentences and comma splices=0) 1

Is there even ONE instance of sexist usage? ("man" is used even once to mean "people," "society," "person" or when a gendered pronoun is used with a tacit assumption about which gender usually or "should" fulfill certain rôles – if the author goofed or if you're not sure, use - 1; if it's flawless, use 0) 0

Do you consider the writing stylish, so well-crafted and flawless that it's publishable as is? (this is a very rare achievement, perhaps one person out of 100: Is this paper stylish? yes=1, like extra credit; all the rest of us mere mortals=0) 1

GRAND OVERALL SCORE (range: -5 to +20) 20

Comments:

Please offer some advice for fixing problems you've found and praise for anything that's already strong in your colleague's essay.