

RES 5040 Students,

Below is an organizational chart to show how the cross-cohort peer review of research proposals are organized. You will find your partner by reading the chart horizontally. In all cases, with the exception of one, each student is paired with another student; thus, Amy and Barbara are paired, Heather and Scott H. are paired, and so on. Sherry, Craig, and Kristen will form a loop with each other. I put in some color-coding to hopefully avoid any confusion.

The steps for the peer review are as follows:

1. Sign up for an account on Buzzword (<https://buzzword.acrobat.com/#o>). Remember to use your ASU email address.
2. Read the “Welcome to Buzzword” and “Help” link on the front page of Buzzword – the “How do you use Buzzword?/Sharing documents” section will explain how we will use Buzzword for peer reviews.
3. Communicate with your peer reviewer regarding when you would like to have the peer review complete. The deadline for the final proposal to be submitted is March 7, so you’ll need review time and revision time. NOTE: You can submit proposals on Sunday, March 8 – but I absolutely need them by 12 noon on that day! Data collection begins on March 9!
4. When you are ready, upload a **draft** of your research proposal. *It does **not** have to be finished.*
5. Click on Share to invite your partner (below) to be a Reviewer, and invite me to be a Reader (jacksonay@appstate.edu).
6. Review proposals using the features of Buzzword.
7. Set up a Zone meeting with your partner to review your comments.

Content for the peer review:

MINIMAL	EXPECTED
Personal context is described and is connected to professional interests.	Personal context is described and is connected to professional interests. There is a detailed anecdotal story (or two) for the background that gives the reviewer insight into the researcher.
Action research methodology is described but not connected to the current research project.	Action research methodology is described and connected to the current project.
Site and sample are described, but the reviewer still has questions about setting and participants.	Site and sample are described in rich detail so that they are pictured in the reviewer’s/readers’ mind.
Methods and data are summarized, but not concrete.	Methods and data are clear and elaborate – reviewer knows who, what, when, where, and how in regard to data collection.
Validity, ethics, and politics are mentioned, but not elaborated.	Validity, ethics, and politics are described thoroughly with detail.

BUNCOMBE LIBRARY SCIENCE COHORT			GASTON SATURDAY ITC COHORT	
NAME	EMAIL		NAME	EMAIL
Sherry Fender	fendersa@appstate.edu	PAIRED WITH	Craig Cavender	cavendercs@appstate.edu
Amy Galloway	woodas@appstate.edu		Kristen Clark	clarkkl@appstate.edu
Heather Greene	hg79178@appstate.edu		Barbara Cloninger	cloningerba1@appstate.edu
John Harrington	harringtonjm@appstate.edu		Scott Harrill	harrillsr@appstate.edu
Nikki Jaynes	jaynesen@appstate.edu		Scott Heavner	heavnerjs@appstate.edu
Lyme Kedic	kedicl@appstate.edu		Jeff Kitchen	kitchenjw@appstate.edu
Jill Mann	mannjn@appstate.edu		Tina Mallen	nicholsontm@appstate.edu
Elizabeth McMullan	mcmullanea@appstate.edu		Jason Mammano	mammanojm@appstate.edu
Amanda Ogle	an79061@appstate.edu		Conrad Martin	martinc@appstate.edu
Daniel Skinner	skinnerde@appstate.edu		Matt Maurer	maurermt@appstate.edu
Tara Smith	smithtj1@appstate.edu		Roxie Miller	millerrn@appstate.edu
Katherine Whyte	whytekl@appstate.edu		Shannon Mosteller	mostellersl@appstate.edu
			Kyle Wood	woodjk@appstate.edu