In reviewing a colleague’s efforts, the editor contributes to the decision that the paper is completed. What an editor tries to help an author achieve is a sense that this paper is ready for evaluation, or that some work needs to be done before the paper is handed in. The paper needs evaluation in two areas, **content** and **mechanics**.

I. *What do you like about this paper?*

II. **Content:** In helping your colleague, consider the following questions as you read the paper:

   A. Is the paper well organized?
      1. Is the curriculum plan presented?
      
         2. Is the literature *research*?
      
         3. Does the literature review support the topic?
            a. recent research?
            
               b. appears to be a complete bibliography?
            
               c. categories help lead the reader through the research?
            
               d. conclusions drawn from the research to support the need and feasibility?
            
         4. Response to possible objections—
      
         5. Sequence of events or conditions that would make the proposal a reality—
      
         6. Bibliography—
B. Is the point clear, or am I trying to guess what this is about?

C. Is the research used effectively?

D. Does the author have good reasons for what s/he wants to do?

E. Have I been persuaded? Would I like to see this curriculum in the schools?

F. Have I been convinced that this proposal can achieve something worthwhile?

III. **Mechanics**

A. Attention to obvious grammatical and spelling typos.

B. Attention to less obvious difficulties, such as run-on sentences, endless paragraphs.

C. Check for proper footnoting/referencing within the body of the text.

D. Check for nonsexist, nonracist language.

E. Correct bibliographic format.

IV. **What overall suggestions do you have for the author?**