

WEBS6203 Peer review process and structure

Overview

The purpose of the peer review is for you to act as a critical friend.

Two pairs of eyes and two brains are definitely better than one.

A critical friend can tell you what is particularly good about your work, and explain to you, how

You can choose how to do the peer review, you may find it helpful just to be in the same room together, and follow the workflow, or you may prefer to fit in the reviewing to your own individual schedule and then meet face to face or virtually to provide feedback to each other.

Workflow

1.	Read through the assignment specification (Appendix A) to make sure that you understand the objectives
2.	Read the paper as a whole
3.	Think about the paper, jot down notes or thoughts
4.	Reread the paper to check out your impression
5.	Work through the feedback grid, check against the paper to confirm your selection, selections may overlap more than one section
6.	Move on to written feedback which is more specific
7.	Write a brief summary to check that you understand the paper– couple of sentences – guidelines in notes section
8.	Use the marking form writing bullet notes
9.	Provide general notes which elaborate any issues you identified
10.	Find a time to sit down with your partner and discuss the paper face to face virtually, whatever you do talking is usually better than just a written summary

Notes

Note for point 7

Write a short summary explaining what the report is about...

e.g. "This report addresses the web science question of how can we take a web science approach to better understand the online market for pharmaceutical drugs. It analyses this from the dual perspectives of psychology and sociology".

You might go on to elaborate commenting on:

- the sub-fields or specialisms within the chosen disciplines
- the methods and methodologies which have been selected and compared

Note for point 8

Use the marking form to help you think about how to provide feedback

Read carefully, make an effort to understand what the writer is saying

Note for point 9

Provide general comments

- Could you understand what the paper was saying from what they wrote?
- What small changes would make the biggest improvements?
- Provide constructive criticism
- Not only of technical issues, but also organization and clarity.
- Are there things you wanted to see?
- Quality argumentation?
- Quality of writing?
- A manageable number of references?
- table of typos and grammatical errors, and minor textual problems.

Note for point 10

- Take turns, go through the feedback point by point, writer, listen to the feedback and then discuss whether you agree or not, and then both discuss how you might change things.
 - You (the writer) may not have an immediate answer or solution, that is OK
- If you (the reviewer) had trouble understanding parts of the paper, try to explain your difficulties to your partner.
 - Give them an opportunity to try to explain in their own words what they were trying to say or do

Mark information is provided for information and guidance so you understand our standards
highlight or circle rough areas to calibrate your feedback

Feedback on specific aspects of the content - areas of potential improvement							
Criterion	0-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
	fail	near pass	pass	2.1	first	distinction	prize worthy
Report: 1 -Identify questions in Web Science which can be analysed a number of disciplinary perspectives	question unclear or confused	perspectives limited/ not appropriate	perspectives limited but appropriate	perspectives sufficient mostly appropriate	perspectives sufficient, largely appropriate	perspectives extensive largely appropriate	perspectives extensive, compelling totally appropriate
Report: 2 Select, summarise, and survey a body of disciplinary knowledge	no evidence/ confused	limited/ not appropriate	limited but appropriate	sufficient mostly appropriate	sufficient, largely appropriate	extensive largely appropriate	extensive totally appropriate
Report: 3 Analyse and explain the differences in disciplinary approaches to modelling, understanding and researching the world	no evidence/ confused	some methodologies identified	methodologies clearly identified	different methodologies well explained	strong exposition of available methodologies	comprehensive exposition of available methodologies	extensive exposition of available methodologies
Report: 4 Analyse the comparative strengths of a variety of methodologies and techniques to Web Science topics	no evidence/ confused	limited analysis mostly descriptive	basic analysis but incomplete	basic analysis provides some insights	comparative analysis provides sound insights	sound comparative analysis with strong insights	extensive comparative analysis & insights
Report: 5 Synthesise a position on Web Science issues, drawn from a broad evidence base	lacks evidence/ confused	limited selection mostly descriptive	adequate selection analysis incomplete	balanced selection sound analysis	strong balanced selection good analysis	extensive selection insightful analysis	extensive selection insightful/powerful insights
Report: 6 Communicate information at the forefront of your discipline in writing	incoherent or disjoint	conversational style/lacks balance	overly journalistic or does not summarise	mostly balanced & appropriate style	balanced & appropriate style	mostly skilfully written balanced & appropriate style	skilfully written balanced & appropriate style
Does it meet specifications?		write/list descriptive feedback on match to specification					
Any appropriate report template is acceptable, but it must include a table of contents, appropriate section headings and be fully referenced. It should be up to 2,500 words in length, not including the reference list and table of contents.	poor match with specification						meets all specification requirements

Reviewer: Use the form structure to order your bullet point comments
 Author: you may use indicative weighting to decide how you prioritise changes

Name:					email:		
Criterion	0-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	80-89%	90-100%
	fail	near pass	pass	2.1	first	distinction	prize worthy
Introduction: (10%)							
Clear account of the chosen topic and the rationale for analysing it from the two chosen perspectives.							
Body: (60% total allocated as below)							
structure and detail 10%							
Follows report structure, error free professional document							
analysis 25%							
A clear description of the models, methodologies and approaches of the two chosen disciplines, and an analysis of how this is of value							
scholarly argument 25%							
The structure of the argument is clear and supported in a scholarly manner that is supported by appropriate levels of referencing for the specified task							
Argumentation discussion and conclusions: 20% total allocated as below)							
The line of argument is clear throughout, balanced and is coherently drawn together in the closing sections of the report							
NB: A further 10% of the course marks are from the Poster							
General comments/observations							

Provide a list of typos

Appendix A

WEBS6203 Assignment Instructions

Module:	<i>Independent Disciplinary Review</i>				<i>saw/sgb</i>
Assignment:	<i>Report</i>			Weighting:	<i>90%</i>
Deadline report:	<i>09/01/2015</i>	Feedback:	<i>02/02/2015</i>	Effort:	<i>90 hours</i>

In the course of the module you are asked to research an interdisciplinary questions in web science from the perspective of two individual disciplines and prepare a poster and a report based on your investigations.

Specifically you are asked to

- Identify a question in Web Science which can be analysed a number of disciplinary perspectives, selecting two disciplinary perspectives which you consider would generate new insights.
- Explain the broad approach of your chosen disciplines and then identify key concepts and research approaches that are particularly applicable to the Web Science question which you are addressing
- Compare and contrast the disciplinary approaches and research traditions and explain how a synthesis of research approaches would enable the identification of new knowledge and insights.

This assessment is summative in nature, distilling the understanding that you have been developing and reflecting on through your blog posts over the course of the module. Your report will demonstrate that you have achieved the learning objectives for this module (reproduced below). In summary, your report should describe the models, methodologies and approaches of two disciplines as they are applicable to the topic relevant to Web that you have previously identified. Good reports will not only draw from your chosen disciplines, but they will also try to synthesise and articulate, a joined-up, inter-disciplinary perspective on the topic. You are asked to include an appendix of your peer review and reflection.

Submission

The report can be created using any appropriate software (such as Microsoft Word) but must be submitted in PDF format. Any appropriate report template is acceptable, but it must include a table of contents, appropriate section headings and be fully referenced. It should be up to 2,500 words in length, not including the reference list and table of contents.

The report should be submitted in PDF format, suitable for printing at A4 size.

Please submit your report using the ECS electronic hand-in system <http://handin.ecs.soton.ac.uk/>

Submit before midnight on the due date.

Relevant Learning Outcomes

1. Identify questions in Web Science which can be analysed a number of disciplinary perspectives
2. Select, summarise, and survey a body of disciplinary knowledge
3. Analyse and explain the differences in disciplinary approaches to modelling, understanding and researching the world
4. Analyse the comparative strengths of a variety of methodologies and techniques to Web Science topics
5. Synthesise a position on Web Science issues, drawn from a broad evidence base
6. Communicate effectively information at the forefront of your discipline in a variety of ways

Marking Scheme

Criterion	Description	Outcomes	Total
Introduction	A clear account of the chosen topic and the rationale for analysing it from the two chosen perspectives	1,3,6	10
Body: structure and detail	Follows report structure, error free professional document	2,3,4,5,6	10
Body: analysis	A clear description of the models, methodologies and approaches of the two chosen disciplines, and an analysis of how this is of value	2,3,4,5,6	25
Body: scholarly argument	The structure of the argument is clear and supported in a scholarly manner that is supported by appropriate levels of referencing for the specified task	2,3,4,5,6,	25
Argumentation, discussion and conclusions	The line of argument is clear throughout, balanced and is coherently drawn together in the closing sections of the report	2,3,4,5,6,	20

Late submissions will be penalised at 5% per working day. No work can be accepted after feedback has been given. Please note the University regulations regarding academic integrity.

Detailed Marking Criteria

The report accounts for 90% of the total final mark.

Within that marking the relative weight given to different aspects of the report is as follows:

Introduction: (10)

Clear account of the chosen topic and the rationale for analysing it from the two chosen perspectives

Body: (60 total allocated as below)

- I. A report template is used which clearly structures the content, all necessary parts of the report are present. The text is error free and consistently formatted. A professional looking document (5).
- II. A clear description of the models, methodologies and approaches of the two chosen disciplines, and an analysis of how this is of value (25)
- III. The argument is presented clearly in the body of the text in a scholarly manner that is supported by appropriate levels of referencing for the specified task in Harvard specification format. Appropriate and relevant use of figures and diagrams is incorporated into the argument. All figures and diagrams are labelled clearly (25)

Argumentation, Discussion and Conclusions: (20)

- I. The argument is presented clearly throughout; the discussion, conclusions and future work is drawn together logically and evidently synthesised. (10)
- II. The contribution of each chosen discipline is equally evaluated, providing the reader with a clear and persuasive conclusion. (10)

Notes

Examples

Examples drawn from anonymised versions of previous reports are provided to demonstrate different, yet valid interpretations of the task.

Blogs

The contributions to the blog posts are not marked or evaluated but are included as a developmental activity which will support you in articulating your arguments and determining ways in which you can most effectively address your chosen topic and the contributory disciplines/fields of study.

Style, citation and referencing

Although some of the example reports you are shown may use ACM or IEEE numeric citation and referencing format, for this report we ask you to use Harvard style referencing.

You are expected to cite and reference appropriate publications that provide evidence for your arguments. You may find that a format which uses names and dates helps you organise your arguments and are informative for the reader. The wording of your report is expected to be your own, and for this task you are likely to need to paraphrase information for the reader as well as including direct quotes. Always acknowledge your sources through citations.

You may find that you can augment your argument with the use of figures or diagrams. All figures and tables must be labelled, and if your work includes images which you did not create yourself, you are expected to indicate their source.

Working in groups and academic integrity

You are strongly encouraged to work with your fellow students informally during the research and proof reading stages of preparing this coursework. This may mean that you incorporate others' feedback into your final arguments. Furthermore, we have scheduled a recommended deadline for peer review and ask you to submit evidence of the review you conducted and a brief summary of your response to the review you received and your reflections on the process.

As with all university work, it is important to understand that the coursework which you hand in must be written in your own words, excepting cited quotations.

Please ensure that you are aware of the University's regulations regarding academic integrity. All assignments are routinely examined using plagiarism detection software which will detect any overlap with the work of other students as well as any text which has been cut and pasted from information already published on the Internet.

Associated tasks and deadlines

You are asked to take part in a peer review process before the Christmas vacation. You will be asked to complete a reflection on this process and add this as an appendix to the main report, thereby providing evidence of the process at the same time as the report handin. There are no marks specifically allocated for the reflection and peer review, they are designed to help you produce a higher quality standard or work. It provides you with an opportunity to document the value of input from fellow students and to help you formalise your understanding of the value of this process.