

UBC Geography 419: Research in Environmental Geography.

David Brownstein.

Peer Editing Exercise.

This assignment will take place, in class, on **February 24th, 2016**, and it is worth 10% of your final grade (5 marks for draft, 5 for your feedback). Aim for a document of *seven pages, or 1750 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 or research question
- a literature review describing the sources you have consulted, and your primary sources
- a description of your method
- proper citations (a bibliography)

Ideally it will also contain:

- some preliminary results
- preliminary recommendations
- 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 Feb 24 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
An improvement over literature review?	Yes, a leap forward	Yes, a moderate improvement	Very slight advancement	A recycled literature review
Length	Spot on.	Slightly too short or too long.	Very short, or very long.	Simply inappropriate length.
Argument/recommendations?	Yes, a new improved version.	Yes, but some suggested improvements not made.	Present, but not enough improvements.	Not present.
Evidence/citations	Strong support for points being made, sources easy to find.	Good support for points, perhaps some citations need work.	Little evidence or sources unclear or obscured.	No start to providing evidence for point of view.
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.
Organization	Well organized with a helpful structure	Fairly well organized needing some small improvements	Organization present but needs more attention	Poorly organized
Quality of feedback	High, very useful	Good, but want more	Moderate, unclear	Not useful