

**Introduction Section Peer Review**

**Redwood High School**

**Name** \_\_\_\_\_

**Per.** \_\_\_\_\_

1. Have your introduction reviewed by (2) two peers.
2. As a reviewer: Check ‘Yes’ if the component is present and complete, check ‘NI’ if the component is present, but need Improvement and check ‘No’ if the component is missing.
3. Assign each introduction a rubric score based on its content, format and quality.
4. Justify why the rubric score was assigned using the language of the Laboratory Report Grading Rubric. Write your justifications in the column labeled ‘Comments’.

**Peer Reviewer #1:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Rubric Score** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Introduction Section</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>NI</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Is complete and correct background information and prior knowledge supporting the experiment given?				
Is the IV and DV explained? Is the relationship between them explained?				
Is the purpose of the experiment clearly stated? And is it explained why the experiment is important. Is this experiment compared to other studies?				
Is how the experiment is expected to turn out explained, including expected results?				
Is introduction supported by research (including proper citations)?				

**Peer Reviewer #2:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Rubric Score** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Introduction Section</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>NI</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Is complete and correct background information and prior knowledge supporting the experiment given?				
Is the IV and DV explained? Is the relationship between them explained?				
Is the purpose of the experiment clearly stated? And is it explained why the experiment is important. Is this experiment compared to other studies?				
Is how the experiment is expected to turn out explained, including expected results?				
Is introduction supported by research (including proper citations)?				

**■ Rubric**

**6 – Exceptional Performance (100%)**

• the introduction section is written with clarity and depth; the student demonstrates mastery of the scientific process by establishing significant connections between experiment’s purpose, rationale, hypothesis and conclusion

**5 – Commendable Performance (92%)**

• the introduction section is very well-written, but lacking the clarity and depth of a six point report; the student demonstrates thorough understanding of the scientific process by establishing relevant connections between the experiment's purpose, rationale, hypothesis and conclusion

**4 – Capable Performance (84%)**

• the introduction section is well-written and accurate; the student demonstrates understanding of the scientific process by demonstrating connections between the experiment's purpose, rationale, hypothesis and conclusion

**3 – Fair Performance (78%)**

• the introduction section is largely pertinent and accurate, but may be lacking in overall clarity; the student’s understanding of the scientific process is adequate, but may be incomplete in some aspects; connections between the experiment's purpose, rationale, hypothesis and conclusion may be present, but are not complete

**2 – Limited Performance (68%)**

• the introduction section is weak, lacking in clarity, relevance and/or accuracy; the student does not demonstrate an understanding of the scientific process; connections between the experiment's purpose, rationale, hypothesis and conclusion weak or incomplete

**1 – Minimal Performance (60%)**

• the introduction section is severely lacking or not evident; the student does not demonstrate an understanding of the scientific process and does not attempt to make connections between the experiment's purpose, rationale, hypothesis and conclusion weak or incomplete

