### Sedimentology Peer-Review rubric (ERS313 – Fall 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent (~A)</th>
<th>Most Expectations (~B)</th>
<th>Some Expectations (~C)</th>
<th>Below Expectations (~D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Grammar and syntax 1 pt   | • Reviewer objectively and effectively provided means of improving the writing quality of the proposal  
• Reviewer effectively highlighted issues with poorly defined terminology | • Reviewer provided good means of improving the writing quality of the proposal  
• Reviewer highlighted issues with poorly defined terminology | • Reviewer could have done more to help improve the writing quality of the proposal  
• Reviewer did little to help with poorly defined terminology | • Reviewer did not improve the writing quality of the proposal  
• Reviewer did not identify poorly defined terminology |
| Organization and clarity 2 pts | • 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 | • 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 | • 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 | • 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               | • 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) | • 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) | • 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) | • 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) |