

Math 1360 : Panel Review : Fall 2011

Reviewing research projects is as important a skill as doing research itself. The goal of the panel review is to give you an experience with reviewing research reports in applied mathematics. It is loosely modeled on review procedures of national grant foundations.

Each project report will be evaluated by a *panel committee* made of members of the class. The authors of the paper are not allowed to be present during the panel discussion and will be notified about the committee evaluation of the paper by a summary report made by the panel leader.

A *panel discussion leader* is a selected person who leads the overall discussion of the reviewed paper. The leader will elicit comments from the committee members and make notes. The leader will summarize in a paragraph of no more than 300 words the committee evaluation and recommendations and submit it in writing to the instructor **within 48 hours**. A person can be leader only for one paper and for the rest of the papers he/she will be a member of the panel.

Each *member of the committee* (including the panel leaders) has to carefully review all papers assigned to him/her and make notes on evaluation prior to the panel discussion. The member will then contribute to the discussion of each paper during the panel meeting. The notes, together with additional notes taken during discussion, are due at the end of panel discussion to the instructor. In addition, a written evaluation in a paragraph of no more than 300 words of a project of their choice is **due within 48 hours by e-mail to the instructor**.

Each member of the class will be evaluated on his/her performance as a panel discussion leader as well as a committee member. Meaningful participation in the discussion is a must! The instructor will keep close notes on the contributions of each member of the committee to the discussion. You are expected to reflect on at least one aspect of each evaluated paper. The panel review contributes 1/5 of the grade for the project (i.e. 5% of the total grade) and it will be based on the performance in three areas: as a panel discussion leader, member of the panel committee, and submitted notes on the paper evaluation (one per paper).

All term papers are due in electronic version to the instructor before 5pm on Sunday. Instructor will forward the papers to the panel members.

Panel 1:

**meets on Wednesday, December 7
during class time.**

Chen, Chia-Jui

Haibach, Noah J

Chen, Rubing

Constantine, Florica J

Cresswell-Clay, Evan C

Kohler, Clare C

Gu, Wenyan

Li, Wenyao

Addison, Jeremy T

Fritz, Melissa J

Hao, Boning

Thomas, Jeremy M

(discussion leaders in bold)

Panel 2:

**meets on Friday, December 9
during class time.**

Day, Kenyon C

Urick, Hannah T

Cornell, Patrick D

Hebrank, Eve R

Johnson, Lars A

Karlovich, Kathleen G

Lin, Chao

Karim, Helmet

Bechtel, Jonathon S

Demby, Zachary R

Nurnberger, Maxwell P

Wang, David Wen Rui

NAME OF PANEL MEMBER: _____ TITLE OF TERM PAPER EVALUATED: _____

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR A SCIENTIFIC REPORT:

TOTAL SCORE: _____

CRITERIA	UNACCEPTABLE (1 PT)	ACCEPTABLE (2 PTS)	GOOD (3 PTS)	EXCELLENT (4 PTS)
CONTENT (multiply by 10)	<p>o Lacking parts of the report; objectives not clearly stated; lacking full reasoning or justification of justification of the model, its analysis, and discussion</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o All major parts included but some objectives not clearly stated; lacking full reasoning or justification of the model its analysis, and discussion;</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o All major parts of the project included and well explained; all objectives well stated and clear but may be lacking fluency; terms in the model, its analysis, and discussion mostly well stated with minor problems.</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o All major parts of the project included and well explained; all objectives well stated and clear; terms in the model, its analysis, and discussion well justified; the flow of an argument accurate and easy to follow</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>
VOCABULARY (multiply by 2)	<p>o Little or no use of scientific vocabulary; vague description of procedures</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o Minimal or isolated use of scientific vocabulary; obvious that the author is unclear of many definitions and terminology usage</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o Overall good usage of vocabulary; only a few unclear usage of scientific terminology</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o Good usage of vocabulary; it is obvious that the authors understand the scientific nomenclature and terminology</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>
ORGANIZATION (multiply by 3)	<p>o Does not follow the organization of a scientific manuscript.</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o Does follow the organization of a scientific manuscript but many parts are missing or not in order.</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o Does follow the organization of a scientific manuscript. Only few minor mistakes.</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o Does follow the organization of a scientific manuscript without any problems.</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>
GRAPHICS (multiply by 3)	<p>o Inadequate labeling of figures; unclear what figures represent; figure legends missing; bad formatting of tables or figures</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o Graphics available but poor quality and content; figure legend incomplete or missing; bad formatting of tables or figures</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o Figures, tables, and text match and are explained in text; minor formatting problems</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o Graphics add value to text by summarizing or simplifying key ideas; excellent organization and clarity; excellent formatting</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>
LANGUAGE (multiply by 1)	<p>o Apparently spelling and grammar check not performed; sentences unclear;</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o Spelling and grammar errors common; sentences not clear</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o Few or no errors; sentences could improve but meaning is clear</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>	<p>o No errors and excellent sentences; meaning of sentences clear</p> <p><i>Notes:</i></p>

Put additional notes on the reverse side