

## Society of American Archivists – Case Study – Peer Review Assessment Form

Case Study Title:	Case Study Author:
Series Title (and Editor): Case Studies on Teaching with Primary Sources (RAO Section)	Reviewer: (remove name before sharing with author)

*Instructions for the Peer Reviewer:* Referring to the description/template for the case study series to which this piece was submitted, please highlight or shade the box that best matches your judgment. Your identity will not be shared directly with the author, but your ratings and comments may be shared. When you have completed your review, please return the form to Series Editor (twps-casestudies@archivists.org).

Criterion	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Comments
Relevance of the Topic	<u>Highly relevant</u> to the mission and purpose of the case study series to which it was submitted	<u>Somewhat relevant</u> to the mission and purpose of the case study series to which it was submitted	<u>Marginally relevant</u> to the mission and purpose of the case study series to which it was submitted	<u>Not relevant</u> to the mission and purpose of the of the case study series to which it was submitted	
Context and Statement of Problem or Purpose	<u>Excellent</u> statement of the context/theoretical or practical problem or challenge	<u>Good</u> statement of the context/theoretical or practical problem or challenge	<u>Fair</u> statement of the context/theoretical or practical problem or challenge	<u>Poor</u> statement of the context/theoretical or practical problem or challenge	
Methodology/Narrative	<u>Thoroughly develops</u> major points with evidence and solid reasoning	<u>Adequately develops</u> major points with evidence and reasoning	<u>Somewhat develops</u> major points with evidence and reasoning	Contains <u>major problems</u> with the quality of the evidence and reasoning	
Analysis/Discussion	Analyzes/discusses issues in a <u>sophisticated and thought-provoking</u> fashion	Analyzes/discusses issues in a <u>good or adequate</u> fashion	Analyzes/discusses issues in a <u>minimally acceptable</u> fashion	Analyzes/discusses issues in an <u>incomplete or unacceptable</u> fashion	
Organization	<u>Excellent</u> organization of ideas and supporting points, fully <u>complies</u> with case study template	<u>Good</u> organization of ideas and supporting points; <u>substantially complies</u> with case studies template	<u>Fair</u> organization of ideas and supporting points; <u>marginally complies</u> with case studies template	<u>Poor</u> organization of ideas and supporting points; <u>does not comply</u> with case studies template	

Mechanics	<u>Few</u> to no errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	<u>Some</u> errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	<u>Many</u> errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	<u>Major</u> errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format	
Learning Objectives	<u>Thoroughly and coherently addresses</u> the learning objectives listed on the submission form.	<u>Adequately addresses</u> the learning objectives listed on the submission form; some objectives addressed more thoroughly than others.	<u>Inadequately or unclearly addresses</u> the learning objectives listed on the submission form.	<u>Fails to address</u> one or more of the learning objectives listed on the submission form.	

**Recommendation:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ **Accept in current form.** The case study is acceptable for publication, with minor copy editing.
- \_\_\_\_\_ **Revise and resubmit.** Please describe suggested revisions above or in “Additional Comments for Author” (next page).
- \_\_\_\_\_ **Reject.** The case study does not merit publication or is not suitable for this series.

**Additional Comments for the Author:**

**Additional Comments for the Editor(s) (Will not be shared with the Author):**