

Peer Review: The FYS Committee Practice Run

Instructions: Review your partner's draft against the criteria below. These are drawn directly from the *FYS Committee Proposal Evaluation Form* and the *Proposal Guidelines*.

Be Honest: If you cannot clearly see the evidence, check "No".

Your name:

Your partner's name:

PART 1: RED FLAG CHECKS

If these are present, the proposal is often returned before a full review.

Criteria	Verdict	Feedback / Suggested Fix
The Reading List (Section 3) Is it organized by theme/unit and scaffolded?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Format (Section 2) Does it list specific methods (e.g., Think-Pair-Share, Lab visits)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Overlap Check (Section 1) Does the description promise an <i>inquiry</i> into a problem?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

PART 2: THE 4 CORE COMPETENCIES (SLOs)

The Committee evaluates based on how/whether the proposal addresses the four Student Learning Outcomes.

SLO 1: Critical Reading

Definition: Understanding, extracting, and questioning written text.

Does the proposal identify a text that is "increasingly sophisticated"? Does it describe *how* students will question it (e.g., via annotations or reflection logs)?

- Yes, it's obvious.
- No, it looks like they just read for content.

SLO 2: Inquiry & Analysis

Definition: Posing and responding to complex ideas; deconstructing complexity.

Does the course ask a question that has no single right answer? Is there an assignment that requires "collecting evidence" to form a judgment?

Peer Review: The FYS Committee Practice Run

- Yes, the inquiry is clear.
- No, it looks like a lecture course.

SLO 3: Critical Thinking

Definition: Evaluate different points of view.

Can you point to a specific assignment where students must compare two conflicting perspectives (e.g., Perspective A vs. Perspective B)?

- Yes. Which assignment (list it here):
- No

SLO 4: Communication

Definition: Construct cogent arguments in written and ORAL form.

Is there a graded ORAL component? (Presentations, debates, leading class discussion). *Note: Participation alone is usually not enough.*

- Yes. Which assignment (list it here):
- No

PART 3: THE NARRATIVE LINK (Section 5)

The Guidelines state: Do not take for granted that the committee can see a link. Make the direct connections obvious.

The "Obvious" Test: Read Section 5 (Outcomes). Did the author use the "Formula"?
"Students will [SLO Verb] by doing [Specific Assignment]..."

- Yes: The link is explicit.
- No: They pasted the definition but didn't link it to a specific assignment.

SUMMARY

Reviewer's Final Note: *If you could change ONE thing to make this proposal stronger, what would it be?*