

UBC History 490R: The Environmental History of British Columbia.

David Brownstein.

Peer Editing Exercise.

This assignment will take place, in class, on **Wednesday March 15th, 2017**, and it is worth 5% of your final grade. Aim for a document of *eight pages, or 2000 words*.

Please come to class with a hard copy *rough draft* of your research paper. While we are still very far from having anything approaching a complete text, this rough draft should focus your thoughts, and form a skeleton for your upcoming presentation.

At a minimum, your draft should contain:

- a short blurb, before the actual draft, letting your peer editor know how they can best help you
- then, your draft will begin with a brief introduction
- a statement of your argument
- a literature review describing the sources you have consulted, and evidence of primary sources that you have consulted so far
- a description of the method you are using, if appropriate
- proper citations (a bibliography)

Ideally it will also contain:

- some preliminary results, outlining the general arc of your narrative
- suggestions for future research.

In class, you will exchange papers with a peer. After reading their draft, answer the following questions. Your responses should be *in writing*, directly on the draft somewhere.

Respond, in direct fashion, to the author's request for assistance.

What do you like best about this draft?

Does the introduction grab your attention?

What is the point of this research? Is it communicated clearly?

Does all of the prose refer back to the main point?

Are there any places in which you get lost?

Which paragraphs work well? Which ones need further development?

Does the conclusion point forward?

Can you suggest improvements to the draft?

At this stage, we are *not* as concerned with minutiae. We are peer editing, not copy editing. Please do not tell your peer that there is nothing wrong with their draft. Similarly, do not become an attack dog and shred their work.

See over for marking rubric.

	Sophisticated 80-100	Quite good 70 - 79	Sufficient 60 - 69	Inadequate < 60
Brought hard copy to class on time March 15 th ?	Yes	Yes, but late	Yes, but very late, or only in digital form.	No
Were there specific instructions for the editor?	Yes, in great detail.	Yes, but sparse or not as direct.	Yes, but very sparse or perfunctory.	No
Length	Spot on.	Slightly too short or too long.	Very short, or very long.	Simply inappropriate length.
Argument	Yes, a new improved version.	Yes, but some suggested improvements not made.	Present, but not enough improvements.	Not present.
Sources	There is a good start to include primary sources from the archives.	There is a modest start to include primary sources.	Only a hint of primary sources included.	No primary sources. Merely a restatement of the literature review.
Narrative	The shape and direction of the narrative are taking form	The shape and direction are present but there are big gaps	Shape and direction need a lot of work	Narrative is entirely unclear
Good clean prose. Correct grammar, well structured.	Yes, error free and very well structured.	Yes, though the odd error here and there.	Errors peppered throughout.	Very poor and extremely hard to read.
Quality of feedback	High, very useful	Good, but want more	Moderate, unclear	Not useful