Name..... Area of Inv..... Date.....

RESEARCH EVALUATION CRITERIA CHECKLIST		✓	COMMENTS
ADEQUACY AND SUFFICIENCY OF RESEARCH ***The researcher's investigation follows the Research Frame and the information gathered is sufficient.***	**Adequacy of the research:** The researcher's investigation is based on the Research Frame and the claims and information presented link directly to the Inquiry Paths.		
	Sufficiency of the answers: The answers formulated by the researcher based on his investigation are sufficient to cover the scope of each Inquiry Path.		
	Adequacy of the scope and focus of the research: No Inquiry Questions or Paths of the research seem irrelevant or useless with respect to the Research Frame.		
CREDIBILITY AND RICHNESS OF SOURCES ***The sources gathered by the researcher are credible and rich.***	**Credibility of sources :** The sources gathered by the researcher are credible.		
	Richness of sources: The researcher found a reasonable amount of rich sources that provide important information that is relevant to the inquiry.		
RANGE OF PERSPECTIVES ***The researcher has considered a wide range of perspectives.***	**Richness of perspectives:** The researcher has considered and explored multiple perspectives.		
	Sufficiency of perspectives: No important perspective has been ignored.		
	Balance among perspectives: There is no over reliance in any one source or perspective.		
ACCURACY OF THE PERSPECTIVE ***The EBCs drawn from the analysis of the sources are coherent, sound and supported.***	**Coherence of EBCs:** The evidence-based claims drawn from the analysis of the sources are coherent with respect to the Research Frame.		
	Soundness of EBCs: The evidence-based claim demonstrates knowledge of and sound thinking about the area of investigation.		
	Support for EBCs : The evidence-based claims are supported by quotations and examples from the texts.		

ODELL EDUCATION

BY-NC

Presenter: ..... **Reviewer:** .....

Work in small groups to evaluate each other's research. Rotate roles in your group.

AS A PRESENTER:

- **Present your Area of Investigation and Research Frame**. Describe the general scope of your research and explain why you are interested in this area.
- **Summarize from your written claims** for each of your answers to the Inquiry Paths. Make sure you reference evidence from sources to support your claims.
- **Present 2 key sources**. Explain why you think they are key, summarize their content and explain your analysis of these sources to your peers. Show your peers and comment on your annotations, notes, and EBCs about these sources.
- Make sure you **give your peers the opportunity to ask you questions** during the entire presentation.
- **Take notes** on a Revising Research tool to determine actions you may take to revise your research based on your peers review.

AS A REVIEWER:

- **Listen** carefully to the presentation. **Ask clarifying questions** to the presenter when necessary.
- Using the table below, **make comments and suggestions** about the presentation answering the guiding questions.

GUIDING QUESTIONS	COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS
What have you learned about the presenter's area of investigation?	
What was interesting to you in the presentation?	
What new information do I need to find to more fully address existing or new Inquiry Paths?	
What was not clear to you in the presentation?	
What would you like to know more about the presenter's area of investigation?	
Do you have any other comment or suggestions that you think would help the presenter improve his work?	

CC BY-NC

PEER EVALUATION OF RESEARCH

Presenter: ..... **Reviewer:** .....

Review the feedback on your Research and think about ways you should you revise your work.
For each action you choose, explain what specific steps you are planning to take.

GUIDING QUESTIONS	MY NOTES, COMMENTS AND FUTURE STEPS
What adjustments and additions do I need to make to my Research Frame?	
Are there sources lacking in credibility that I need to replace?	
What new information do I need to find to more fully address existing or new Inquiry Paths?	
What missing perspectives do I need to research?	
Are there any parts of my research I should discard?	
Other:	

CC BY-NC

REVISING RESEARCH