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# Peer ANALYSIS: DBQ Checklist

Directions: *Use the “Look For…” column to answer whether your peer has included that item in their essays. Whatever the answer, be sure to check the appropriate column. Note little areas for improvement or proof that you found these things as directed.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Look For…** | **Definitely**  *(prove it, can refer to item on paper by marking # and letter)* | | **There was an attempt**  *(please write a note on how it can be improved)* | No evidence of this. |
| Area 1) Introduction and ATQ | | | | |
| **(a)** Is there a narrowing intro ¶ in the ▽ format? |  | |  |  |
| **(b)** Did they set the stage in the opening sentences? |  | |  |  |
| **(c)** Did they include a thesis at the end of ¶1 that makes sense? Underline it. |  | |  |  |
| **(d)** Did the thesis ATQ fully and exactly as it was asked? |  | |  |  |
| **(e)** Is the thesis focused, acknowledging complexity of question? |  | |  |  |
| Name of Analyzer for Area 1: | | | | |
| Area 2) Cohesion and Sense | | | | |
| **(a)** Do they use the proper # of ¶s? | | **5** or **6** or **More**  circle one |  |  |
| **(b)** For every body ¶, does the topic sentence relate directly and obviously to the thesis? | |  |  |  |
| **(c)** Does each body ¶ relate one central idea? (not two, one) | | In the margin make note of the topic of each ¶. | In the margin make note of the topic of each ¶ and note where it could be improved. |  |
| **(d)** Is the best piece of evidence presented first? | | Yes | Arguably | No |
| **(e)** Are the docs chosen to support the topic sentence appropriate? | |  |  |  |
| Name of Analyzer for Area 2: | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Area 3) Document Analysis and Synthesis | | | |
| **(a)** Do they analyze (pick apart) 4-5 documents to support their points? |  |  |  |
| **(b)** Do they *understand* the basic idea behind each doc? |  | Missed one. |  |
| **(c)** Are docs cited appropriately with parentheses and inline? |  |  |  |
| **(d)** Are docs grouped in a logical way? (ie. similar, conflicting) |  |  |  |
| **(e)** Is the relationship between docs explained? |  |  |  |
| Name of Analyzer for Area 3: | | | |
| Area 4) Process and Precision | | | |
| **(a)** Is “outside” historic info used to help prove evidence or analyze docs? |  |  |  |
| **(b)** Is historic information/evidence (not arguments) mostly accurate? |  |  |  |
| **(c)** Are key words spelled correctly? Do grammar mistakes take little away from clear, communication? Is it readable? |  |  |  |
| **(d)** Do they mention pertinent proper names and events specifically? |  |  |  |
| **(e)** Is it written in an academic tone? Is word choice/diction appropriate? |  |  |  |
| Name of Analyzer for Area 4: | | | |

**Any additional comments or encouragements to help the writer** (1 required from each Analyzer.)

1.)

2.)

3.)

4.)