Name of student: Block:

**Peer Edit and Check List: Philosophe Project**

Name of peer editor:

Please read through your partner’s response and check to see if they have fulfilled the following criteria:

* + **One conversation between 3 people (one page minimum, typed).**
	+ **The conversation should be underlined where philosophical opinions are revealed.**
	+ **One paragraph clearly explaining connection between understanding of philosophes, issues, and importance to conversation.**
	+ **A bibliography (optional).**

**QUICK LOOK:** Rate the quality of the dialogue between the three people – circle a smiley:

    

**QUICK LOOK:** Rate the quality of the paragraph that explains the background of the three people – circle a smiley:

    

What do you like about their response?

What could they improve on with more time?

**On the opposite side, circle a number for each criteria that you think your peer deserves, giving justification in the box below for each.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Criterion A: Knowing and Understanding** |
| **(0)** | **Beginning (1-2)** | **Developing (3-4)** | **Accomplished (5-6)** | **Exemplary (7-8)** |
| *I have not achieved a standard described by any of the descriptors to the right*. | *I am able to:*use **limited** relevant terminologydemonstrate **basic** knowledge and understanding of content and concepts with **minimal** descriptions and/or examples.  | *I am able to:*use **some** terminology **accurately** and **appropriately** demonstrate **adequate** knowledge and understanding of content and concepts through **satisfactory** descriptions, explanations and examples.  | *I am able to:*use a **range** of terminology **accurately** and **appropriately**demonstrate **substantial** knowledge and understanding of content and concepts through **accurate** descriptions, explanations and examples.  | *I am able to:***consistently** use **a wide range** of terminology **effectively** demonstrate **detailed** knowledge and understanding of content and concepts through **thorough**, **accurate** descriptions, explanations and examples. |
| **Peer feedback:***(For Criteria A: Focus should be on assessing course knowledge about the Enlightenment, details about the philosophes, and any connecting historical events and significance.)* |
| **Criterion B: Investigating** |
| **(0)** | **Beginning (1-2)** | **Developing (3-4)** | **Accomplished (5-6)** | **Exemplary (7-8)** |
| *I have not achieved a standard described by any of the descriptors to the right*. | *I am able to:*collect and record **limited** information, not always consistent with the research question   | *I am able to:*uses a research method(s) to collect and record **mostly relevant** information   | *I am able to:*use research method(s) to collect and record **appropriate**, **relevant** information  | *I am able to:*use research methods to collect and record **appropriate**, **varied and relevant** information  |
| **Peer feedback:***(For Criteria B: Focus should be on assessing use of class materials and any outside research to provide extra details, showcasing knowledge of the philosophes or of the events being discussed.)* |
| **Criterion C: Communicating** |
| **(0)** | **Beginning (1-2)** | **Developing (3-4)** | **Accomplished (5-6)** | **Exemplary (7-8)** |
| *I have not achieved a standard described by any of the descriptors to the right*. | *I am able to:*communicate information and ideas in **a limited way**, using a style that is **limited** in its appropriateness to the audience and purpose  | *I am able to:*communicate information and ideas **satisfactorily** by using a style that is **somewhat** appropriate to the audience and purpose  | *I am able to:*communicate information and ideas **accurately** by using a style that is **mostly** appropriate to the audience and purpose   | *I am able to:*communicate information and ideas **effectively** and **accurately** by using a style that is **completely** appropriate to the audience and purpose  |
| **Peer feedback:***(For Criteria C: Focus should be on assessing how the final response was written – did they write at least a page of dialogue? Was it formatted well? Does it make sense? Does it come from an interesting angle? How about the paragraph? Is that written well, with an introduction and conclusion and a clear flow of evidence and transitions?)* |
| **Criterion D: Thinking Critically** |
| **(0)** | **Beginning (1-2)** | **Developing (3-4)** | **Accomplished (5-6)** | **Exemplary (7-8)** |
| *I have not achieved a standard described by any of the descriptors to the right*. | *I am able to:***analyse** concepts, issues, models, visual representation and theories to a **limited extent** **identify** different perspectives and **minimal** implications.  | *I am able to:***analyse** concepts, issues, models, visual representation and theories **interpret** different perspectives and **some** of their implications.  | *I am able to:***discuss** concepts, issues, models, visual representation and theories **interpret** different perspectives and their implications.  | *I am able to:*complete a **detailed discussion** of concepts, issues, models, visual representation and theories **thoroughly interpret** a **range** of different perspectives and their implications. |
| **Peer feedback:***(For Criteria D: Focus should be on assessing how ‘deep’ the discussion of philosophy was. Was it clear that each philosophe had multiple ideas? Were these ideas expressed through different discussion topics? Were the issues between the philosophes expressed in more subtle ways?)* |