

GUIDELINES FOR PEER EDITING AND EVALUATION

EDITOR'S NAME: _____ Date: _____

WRITER'S NAME: _____

Editing another person's work is not easy. How can you be constructive without seeming too critical? You need to be aware that a lot of work has already gone into the paper you are reading, so you must put the same kind of effort into your editing. The purpose of this work is to help a fellow student, and at the same time, develop your eye for editing your own work.

- I. Read through the paper once without any particular goal other than to get an overall feel for the content and writing.
- II. Then, go through the paper a **SECOND TIME** more slowly making comments on each of the checklist points, either **directly on the paper and/or on this page**. (If the comments/responses for the below are directly on the paper, then please indicate that next to the question.)
- III. Once you have completed the checklist, discuss with the author of the paper your comments and suggestions. Be sure you and the writer understand the suggestions and comments being made. Remember: **be honest but respectful**. As a writer being edited, remember that your proofreader's ideas may or may not be correct, but are given in the **spirit of helpful criticism**.

Content and Analysis

- 1. (a) Does the introductory paragraph introduce the **MAIN IDEA** of the paper clearly and provide some useful context?
(b) Is the **THESIS** *totally* clear? Does it promise insight, or merely state the obvious? Is it too broad? Too narrow? Overly certain? Overly cautious?
*** Identify the thesis:** _____

- 2. Is **THESIS** addressed and answered?
- 3. Is there **SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE** to support the thesis? Is the evidence **informative, relevant, and thorough**?
- 4. (a) Identify one example supporting a main idea: _____

(b) Identify another example supporting another main idea:

- 5. Does the paper provide a sufficient variety of types of evidence and sources?
- 6. Is the paper **WELL-ORGANIZED**? Does the evidence appear in the order that the thesis suggests it should? Is there a **logical flow** from one point to the next?

- 7. Are there **topic sentences, ANALYSIS** after every piece of evidence, and statements of significance?
- 8. Are there sentences that seem unclear about what you have learned, or sections that skim over important detail? Are there ideas that you think require more explanation?

*** IDENTIFY ANY UNCLEAR SENTENCES OR PHRASES TO THE WRITER.**

Organization and Format

- 1.) Are **CITATIONS** clear and well documented?
- 2.) Are the citations formatted correctly?
- 3.) Is the **BIBLIOGRAPHY** formatted correctly?
- 4.) Are there **SUFFICIENT SOURCES** used? Is there **SUFFICIENT VARIETY** of sources used?
- 5.) Have **SPELLING AND GRAMMAR** been checked?
- 6.) Is the paper too short or too long? Are there areas that need attention?

* If so, please identify these areas:

OVERALL COMMENTS: