PlSc 313   Evaluator's name _____
Paper Evaluation Form
                                      Author's name _____

As a peer evaluator, your job is to evaluate the author's **analysis and evidence**. You are not a copy editor. You are the analysis editor. You do not need to spend time correcting spelling and other technical mistakes. You do need to spend time giving constructive criticism on the author's analysis and evidence. Constructive criticism means that you not only point out the weaknesses in the author's analysis, you give suggestions on how to strengthen the analysis. As stated on the syllabus, 10% of your final paper grade is determined by how well you evaluate your peers.

Make any notes that you wish on the author's paper. Also, answer all of the questions below. Make a copy of the author's paper after you have evaluated it (i.e., with all of your notes on it), and a copy of this form after completed. Turn in originals to author, and turn in the copies (or scans) to the instructor on **6 December 2016** (at the beginning of class).

How could the author better characterize the interest group? Is the descriptive background sufficient to understand it? Is there too much information? Too little?

How could the author better apply the theories chosen? What aspects of the theories should be included and applied that have not? How could the author better show what features of the interest group are not explained/predicted by the theory? What other theories should the author have included? Which theories should be dropped?

How could the author better support the analysis from current events sources and the readings? Where specifically is more support needed (discuss here or show on paper)?

How could the author better support her/his argument for which theories she/he finds to be best?

What is missing from this paper that should be included?

Where could the paper be cut?

How well does the author do in the technical aspects of the paper (proper citations; spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors; etc.)?

How well is the paper written (clear sense of direction, transitions, flow, etc.)?

Other comments: