

Guidelines for Peer Review (1-Day Version)— EVALUATION Essay--English 110 (Hale)

- The day before your group meeting, collect copies of your draft from each teammate.
- Once you have received each team member's draft, you should read it through once for the argument's flow.
- After you've read it once, review the "Critical Reading Guide" handout (295-7 on handout) to remind yourself of the features the essay needs to have to be successful (i.e., well-presented subject, criteria, etc.).
- Then, re-read the essay; this time have a pencil in hand and write comments on the hard copy of the draft. You may mark grammar errors you see but focus on CONTENT suggestions.
- Next, **TYPE** out comments that you will share with your teammate. Make sure to put the following header in the top left-hand corner of your response:
Critic's Name (your name)
Author's Name
Date
- Focus your responses on the **STRENGTHS and WEAKNESSES of EACH PARAGRAPH** and be as specific as you possibly can. *You will have a paragraph of comments on each paragraph in your peer's essay.* Make sure to give CONCRETE SUGGESTIONS for how the writer can improve EACH PARAGRAPH. End with a section on the BIG PICTURE of the essay—how well did the writer achieve the 4 main criteria (subject, judgment, reasons/support, opp. views)? How well was the essay organized? How well was the essay written? (grammar/style) Include specific suggestions for improvement.
- Average responses will be about 1, single-spaced page, but the really good responses (and the ones that will earn the highest grades) will have more. Feel free to include questions in your responses. Remember, the purposes of these peer reviews are 1) to help you understand the expectations of the assignment by reviewing someone else's work and 2) to help your peers improve their writing by offering your feedback.
- Staple your typed comments on top of the draft on which you have made *handwritten comments*, and bring it to the group conference.
- Arrive at your group conference in our classroom a few minutes early. Have all of your materials out and ready to go, so we don't have to waste time shuffling papers (DON'T FORGET TO **BRING A COPY OF YOUR OWN PAPER** SO YOU CAN FOLLOW OUR DISCUSSION). One of you should volunteer to be the first victim ☺; then, each critic will give his/her impressions of the paper and give comments, paragraph-by-paragraph, on STRENGTHS and WEAKNESSES of the author's draft being as specific as possible. {Critic 1 on paragraph 1, Critic 2 on paragraph 1, Critic 3 on paragraph 1; Critic 1 on paragraph 2, Critic 2 on paragraph 2, Critic 3 on paragraph 2; etc. Critics will also offer CONCRETE SUGGESTIONS for how the author might improve the essay. The author should **take notes** while the critics are giving feedback and use the notes to supplement the written feedback the critics will provide. We will go through this process for each author. I will mostly serve as a facilitator for this discussion—each student will provide the content. **GIVE YOUR TEAMMATES THE TYPED COMMENTS YOU HAVE MADE AT THE END OF THE CONFERENCE SO THEY CAN USE THEM TO IMPROVE DRAFTS.**
- A few more words about feedback:
 - In a peer critique, you are only offering suggestions for the author. You should not be correcting the draft. Rather, it is your responsibility to point out areas that can be improved and areas that are particularly strong. The author must analyze your comments and decide how to integrate the suggestions into the next draft.
 - “Being nice” and only pointing out strengths of a piece of writing, or exaggerating the effectiveness of some aspect of the writing, will not help the author, nor will it help you to recognize writing that needs improvement.
- You will receive grades for your reviews of peers based on the written and oral feedback you give. I will base the grade on how thorough and accurate you are, how well you use the concepts we've discussed to focus your responses (i.e., judgment, criteria, alternative views), and how specific your suggestions are.
- After the group conference is over, each author should make a **PLAN FOR REVISION** based on the feedback you received. First, give an overview of what the critics said—*what were the main strengths and weaknesses they pointed out?* Then, give your response—*what advice are you going to follow to improve the draft and what advice are you going to ignore? In what ways are you still confused about the critics' reactions and how are you going to address this confusion.* **INCLUDE THE PLAN FOR REVISION AND EACH PACKET OF PEER CRITIQUES IN YOUR PORTFOLIO.**