

**ASSESSMENT: PEER REVIEW
EXPRESSION OF INTEREST
FOR DESIGNING A PUBLIC HEALTH INITIATIVE
TO IMPROVE STI CONTROL**

Prevention and control of STIs and HIV (POPH 90068) 2018

Description

The purpose of this assignment is to:

- identify the outcome of your peer's project
- demonstrate your understanding of the intervention
- demonstrate your ability to provide thoughtful, respectful and meaningful constructive feedback that will allow your peer to improve or strengthen their work

You will automatically be assigned a classmate's assignment to critique via Turnitin after the EOI draft submission deadline of 11pm Sun 14 Oct AEST. Shortly after this deadline you will see a *Peer review of draft EOI* assignment appear under the 'Submit Assessments' menu item of the LMS- this is where you will go to enter and submit your review (it is also where you can go to see the peer review completed in relation to your own EOI draft, and find feedback/grading on your peer review from your instructor).

You will be asked to respond to the following five headings for your critique. *It is strongly recommended that you write and save your responses in Microsoft Word or some other word processing program, then copy and paste them into the Turnitin review (if you write them directly into the review there is a greater risk of losing your work in the event of an internet connection dropout, etc).*

1. Describe the outcome the intervention is trying to achieve.
2. How is the intervention going to be evaluated? Is this appropriate? Give reasons for your answer.
3. Describe the strengths of the intervention.
4. Describe the weaknesses of the intervention.
5. How could you improve this intervention? Please give your reasons.

Note that you are not being asked to provide your peer with a grade of any kind- only responses to the above five questions.

Please review the following guidelines¹ prior to writing your peer review and keep them in mind as you write:

- Read the assignment all the way through before responding to the questions above.
- Offer suggestions, not commands. Be respectful and considerate of the writer's feelings.
- Be clear and specific in your feedback so that your peer will know what you are referring to (for example, terms such as "unclear" or "vague" are too general to be helpful).

- Write your critique in a way that supports your peer to make his/her assignment as strong as possible, ensuring a respectful tone throughout.
- Raise questions that cross your mind, points that may have not occurred to your peer.
- Be careful not to let your own opinions bias your review (for example, do not suggest a complete re-write of the assignment just because you don't agree with the writer's point of view). Avoid turning your peer's paper into your paper.

1. Adapted from Pedagogy in Action. [Guidelines for Students- peer review](#) [Internet]. Science Education Resource Centre, Carlton College. 2018 [cited 21 July 2018].

Length and formatting

- Maximum 500 words in total across the five headings, excluding references (it doesn't matter if you write less than this so long as you have responded to the above five criteria thoroughly and completely). Do not write more than 500 words or marks will be deducted (if word limit exceeds the 10% margin).
- Include references as appropriate (can be in any widely accepted academic style e.g. Vancouver, Harvard, APA; just be consistent in application- see the Referencing folder under the 'Assessment' menu item on the LMS for some style guides)

Grading

15% of your final mark. Your subject coordinator will grade your peer review out of 100 on the basis of:

- the quality and tone of your responses (i.e. logic and structure of your reasoning and suggestions; using a respectful tone throughout; providing specific and meaningful feedback)
- how well you demonstrate your understanding of the intervention and your application of learning and knowledge gained in this subject
- academic presentation (i.e. clarity and conciseness of writing; appropriate referencing where required)

1. Describe the outcome the intervention is trying to achieve **(30 marks)**
2. How is the intervention going to be evaluated? Is this appropriate? Give your reasons for your answer. **(40 marks)**
3. Describe the strengths of the intervention. **(10 marks)**
4. Describe the weaknesses of the intervention. **(10 marks)**
5. How could you improve this intervention? Please give your reasons. **(10 marks)**