Checkpoint 7: IRR Draft, for Peer Review

Work to Do

Students produce a rough draft of their Task 1 Individual Research Report (IRR) for this checkpoint. The IRR is a 1200-word focused literature review that looks at the perspectives and arguments available to their lens or sub-question related to the broader team inquiry. Students enact, adapt, and revise according to their outlines from Checkpoint 6. As a reminder, these individual papers draw upon various well-vetted sources and assess the reasoning, evidence, and validity of those sources. They use the resources purposefully to provide a range of perspectives on the specific subtopic of the team's research question and synthesize and mediate the sources as a conversation on the issues. Lastly, they are correctly formatted, well written, and use consistent source attribution techniques (per teacher directive). Students utilize resources from previous and current modules' lessons, handouts, and presentations.

Once individuals submit their drafts, students engage in a formal peer review activity, providing feedback on grammar and language conventions, organization and logical clarity, and strength of evidence. They may indicate areas where more information is necessary regarding concepts, definitions, or evidence to help warrant the reasoning. Once commentary has been added directly to the reviewee's draft, reviewers respond to the following with specific details:

1. What is the research question central to the inquiry? What is the established relevance (academically, historically, practically, etc.)? Does it do a good job of establishing relevance to the intended audience? Are there areas that need to be improved upon or clarified?
2. In the literature review, what are the incorporated perspectives? Are enough perspectives considered and thoroughly explored, given the scope of the assignment? Are there too many perspectives to provide sufficient depth and nuance? Are there any glaring omissions?
3. Do the resources do a good job of establishing the authority, credibility, or purposeful use of their primary and secondary resources?
4. Do the resources do a good job of establishing areas of agreement and disagreement and acknowledge any gaps in understanding related to the established inquiry question?
5. Does the draft acknowledge its limitations? Are there any significant limitations not yet addressed? Provide help here.

For this checkpoint, students will have two submissions: their draft (submitted first) and the reflection of another student's draft (submitted second).

Teachers may choose to have students peer review more than one paper. They will also decide between assigning students to peer review members of their team, which is advantageous since students know the content and can provide additional resources from a place of knowledge and shared experience. Or they can assign peer reviews of another team, which has the advantage of providing fresh eyes from a different audience, and issues in clarity will be more readily apparent. Students will do informal peer reviews organically throughout the completion of the tasks and can lean on each other for support and help even when not required by formal progress checks.