

Sedimentology Peer-Review rubric (ERS313 – Fall 2017)

Criteria	Excellent (~A)	Most Expectations (~B)	Some Expectations (~C)	Below Expectations (~D)
Grammar and syntax 1 pt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewer objectively and effectively provided means of improving the writing quality of the proposal • Reviewer effectively highlighted issues with poorly defined terminology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewer provided good means of improving the writing quality of the proposal • Reviewer highlighted issues with poorly defined terminology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewer could have done more to help improve the writing quality of the proposal • Reviewer did little to help with poorly defined terminology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewer did not improve the writing quality of the proposal • Reviewer did not identify poorly defined terminology
Organization and clarity 2 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewer effectively highlighted organizational issues • Reviewer expertly highlighted aspects of the proposal that were unclear • Reviewer objectively and effectively provided means of improving the flow of the proposal • Reviewer effectively highlighted aspects of the proposal that were lacking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewer highlighted organizational issues • Reviewer highlighted aspects of the proposal that were unclear • Reviewer provided means of improving the flow of the proposal • Reviewer highlighted aspects of the proposal that were lacking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewer poorly highlighted organizational issues • Reviewer poorly highlighted aspects of the proposal that were unclear • Reviewer poorly provided means of improving the flow of the proposal • Reviewer poorly highlighted aspects of the proposal that were lacking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewer did not comment on organizational issues • Reviewer did not comment on aspects of the proposal that were unclear • Reviewer did not provide means of improving the flow of the proposal • Reviewer did not highlight aspects of the proposal that were lacking
Topic 2 pts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewer made excellent suggestions on how to improve the research hypothesis/goals • Reviewer expertly highlighted how to make the data collection or methods more effective • Reviewer made excellent suggestions for broadening the scope of the research • Reviewer provided excellent additional academic resources (references, websites) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewer made good suggestions on how to improve the research hypothesis/goals • Reviewer highlighted how to make the data collection or methods more effective • Reviewer made excellent suggestions for broadening the scope of the research • Reviewer provided good additional academic resources (references, websites) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewer made suggestions on how to improve the research hypothesis/goals • Reviewer poorly highlighted how to make the data collection or methods more effective • Reviewer made excellent suggestions for broadening the scope of the research • Reviewer provided some additional academic resources (references, websites) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewer did not make suggestions on how to improve the research hypothesis/goals • Reviewer did not comment on how to make the data collection or methods more effective • Reviewer did not comment on broadening the scope of the research • Reviewer did not provide additional academic resources (references, websites)