Ella August

WRTG 120 Peer Review Lesson Plan

The centerpiece of this lesson plan is a video that trains students on how to peer review each other’s draft papers. I use the video about a week before a paper is due, the day of the peer review session.

Each student is required to bring two hard copies of their paper to class, with the idea that each student will review two papers and each student will receive two reviews of their paper.

I start by asking each student to reflect on their own paper and write down anything that they’d like their reviewer to focus on. Once they finish, the writer introduces the paper to the reviewer, highlighting what they’d like the reviewer to focus on. The reviewers use a form (that I hand out, see next page for example) to guide their review. Reviewers spend 15-20 minutes on their review and then meet with the writer to discuss their comments (which should all be written on the form).

I emphasize that students should not mark grammar or spelling “corrections” during this process. We focus on bigger-picture issues.

<http://www.screencast.com/t/LJ4K2iW6lch>

Qualitative Peer Review Form

Draft Title\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Draft Author\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Peer Reviewer (your name) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I recommend that you begin by reading the draft one time thoroughly without making any notations whatsoever. Then read the draft a *second time* and summarize each paragraph of the first 2 pages in the narrative. The third time through, write careful, thoughtful answers to questions 2-8 below. *Please* do not proofread the draft or mark any grammar or spelling on this review.

1. What do you like most about the draft? Please mention at least 2-3 strengths here.
2. Does the title make sense given the paper’s focus? Please comment
3. Did the author follow MLA guidelines? Yes No (please comment)
4. For the “Introduce the genre” section, are there enough details? (if no then comment)
5. For the “Describe its context” section, are all the below points discussed? Do you feel the author is arguing a point and supporting that point with evidence in this section?
* Who is the audience?
* What is the goal it’s attempting to accomplish?
* How do its characteristics help to meet this goal?
1. For the “Analyze the genre” section, are all the below points discussed? Do you feel the author is arguing a point and supporting that point with evidence in this section?
* Does this genre effectively and regularly accomplish its intended goal?
* What are the shortcomings of using this genre? The strengths?
* Would you suggest any alterations to improve the genre? Why or why not?
1. Are two appendices included? (Appendix A should be any example of the genre and Appendix B should be an example of the genre that was made by the student.)
2. Does the author make reference to the appendix in the draft? Yes No
3. Don’t forget to address any specific areas that the writer wanted help with.
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