I consider peer review an important aspect of collaborative learning, and, as such, I include peer review assignments in my course calendar. The following text is taken directly from the syllabus:

**Peer Review**

15% of final grade

Peer review is an important component of your learning this semester, and you should expect to regularly read and respond to your peers' work in insightful and respectful ways. In return, you can expect to receive comments on your own work that are intended to help you gain an outside perspective on your writing for the purpose of revision.

The peer review assignments usually follow this sequence:

1. Students are divided into groups of three. These will be fixed groups for the duration of the semester. Each student will read and respond to two students in the group.
2. Students read about how to do productive peer review. Then we discuss my expectations as well as best practices.
3. Students complete peer review worksheet (usually in class). Students are expected to spend approximately 30 minutes on each review, with much more time given for the final research paper project. (I gave 30 minutes in class for the rough draft peer review for the project below, while the full draft took about 60 minutes.) While students are working, I circulate through the classroom looking at works in progress. This allows me to offer constructive feedback on the peer reviews before the reviews are completed.
4. Students are expected to write a peer review memo to me detailing their experience with both writing and receiving peer reviews.
5. Students then write a memo to the person who did their review. In it, they detail what they found useful, as well as what was not so useful, in the peer review. This memo is meant to help the peer reviewer become better at doing peer review.
Peer Review
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**Purpose**

The purpose of this assignment is to allow you to continue with the research you’ve begun on an issue related to literacy.

**Audience**

Your instructor, visitors to the DALN site, researchers interested in literacy issues.

**Instructions**

For this project, you will research a current arguable issue related to literacy. Please be sure to incorporate your own primary research, as well as a variety of academic sources, both print and online. You may also use several popular sources to support your claims, but the bulk of your research should come from your own primary research and academic sources.

This paper should be 12 (full) to 15 pages long and a works cited page.

**Due Dates**

Arguable Issue Checklist and Audience Analysis: October 22  
Source List: October 24  
Annotated Bibliography: October 29  
Rough Draft: October 31  
Peer Draft: November 5  
Instructor Draft: November 12

**Criteria for Evaluation**

A strong essay will:

- Ask compelling questions about a current issue related to literacy and answer it in provocative ways.
- Develop a complex and interesting line of inquiry that shapes the whole of the essay and gives it a sense of unity.
- Introduce complicating details and integrate them in such a way as to attempt to include an evolving inquiry.
- Demonstrate deep, critical thinking about the broader significance of the issue.
- Demonstrate a clear understanding of purpose, message, and audience.
- Organize ideas in an audience-friendly manner and use transition and connections to create cohesion.
- Incorporate both primary and secondary research to build an argument.
- Successfully demonstrate good academic writing.
- Demonstrate knowledge of MLA citation style.
- Demonstrate knowledge of grammar and punctuation issues covered in class.
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**Purpose**

The purpose of this assignment is for you to offer revision suggestions to your peers. While doing so, I hope you will also learn some things about your own writing.

**Audience**

Your audience is the author of the paper you are reviewing. This means that when you write, you will write TO THE AUTHOR.

**Instructions**

Carefully read through your peer’s paper and then, following the questions below, offer specific revision suggestions. Each peer review should be fairly developed and should take approximately 45 minutes to complete.

**Peer Review Questions**

1. Does the writer fully address the general requirements of the assignment? Assignment details, formatting, following instructions, etc.? If so, please comment on how they do this successfully. If not, please make revision suggestions.

2. Identify the author’s main claim/argument. Does it seem reasonable? Why or why not?

3. Consider arrangement. Identify what each paragraph does. For example, P1 introduces, P2 goes into further introduction by articulating specific arguments to be presented, P3 introduces the first issue, etc.

4. Arrangement (cont.) Then comment on whether the information seems logically arranged. Make suggestions regarding how the author could move around sections of text.

5. Throughout the paper, does the author introduce enough research (their own primary research and secondary, library research) for you to be convinced of his or her argument? Please identify at least two places where s/he could offer more information to support the argument.

6. Does the author include signal phrases when introducing quotations? Does he or she correctly and successfully employ the concepts of the quotation sandwich? Use the following checklist to comment on this section to identify where s/he needs to make revisions:
   a. Does the author establish solid context and introduction for the quote? (i.e. does the author incorporate the quote well enough to make sure it does not seem dropped from nowhere?)
   b. Does the paper smoothly transition between the two voices (the voice of the author of the paper and the voice of the quoted author)?
c. Do you understand why he or she chose the quote? Does the writer take the time to explain the relation between the quote and his or her own argument or does the reader have to figure out how the quote is related?
d. Do you feel satisfied with the level of analysis AFTER the quote?
e. Is each quote connected directly to either the point of the paragraph (check topic sentence) or the thesis of the paper?

8. Does the paper meet the length requirements? If not, identify some places within the paper where the author could go into further development. You may want to ask questions to help the author: What does this mean? Why do you think this happened? Where could this go from here? Who does this affect?
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Purpose

The purpose of this assignment is for you to offer revision suggestions to your peers. While doing so, I hope you will also learn some things about your own writing.

Audience

Your audience is the author of the paper you are reviewing. This means that when you write, you will write TO THE AUTHOR.

Instructions

Carefully read through your peer’s paper and then, following the questions below, offer specific revision suggestions. Each peer review should be fairly developed and should take approximately 45 minutes to complete.

Peer Review Questions

1. Identify the author’s main claim/argument. Does it seem reasonable? Why or why not?

2. Does the author establish his or her scholarly reputation in the beginning paragraphs? If so, how? If not, how could s/he do so?

3. Discuss the author’s use of language in this paper. Does it seem appropriate for the audience? Point out specific instances in which the author may need to adjust his or her tone to be more audience appropriate.

4. Does the author introduce a counter-argument? If so, does it seem to help his or her argument? If not, do you think s/he should do so? Where might this be appropriate?

5. Does the author include an appendix? If so, do the images and information seem important to the paper? Does the author refer to the images in the appendix? If not, do you think the author should include an appendix? What kind of information do you think would be appropriate to include?

6. Consider arrangement. Does any of the information seem out of place? If so, make suggestions regarding how the author could move around sections of text.

7. Comment on the author’s use of transitions. Point out one or two specific instances in which the author does a great job making connections between sentences. Point out two specific instances in which the author does a great job making connections between paragraphs. Point out one specific instance in which the author does a great job making connections between sections. Next, point out one or two specific instances in which the author could do a better job making connections between sentences. Then, point out two specific instances in which the author could do a better job making connections between
paragraphs. And finally, point out one specific instance in which the author could do a better job making connections between sections.

8. Throughout the paper, does the author introduce enough research for you to be convinced of his or her argument? Please identify at least two places where s/he could offer more information to support the argument.

9. Does the author use his or her own primary research? Does the way in which s/he introduces it seem to work?

10. Please briefly discuss the author’s use of outside sources. Does s/he incorporate an adequate amount of research/resources from academic sources? If not, where could the author do so? If the author incorporates popular sources, do the sources seem appropriate for the target audience?

11. Does the author include signal phrases when introducing quotations? Does he or she correctly and successfully employ the concepts of the quotation sandwich? Use the following checklist to comment on this section:
   a. Does the author establish solid context and introduction for the quote? (i.e. does the author incorporate the quote well enough to make sure it does not seem dropped from nowhere? 
   b. Does the paper smoothly transition between the two voices (the voice of the author of the paper and the voice of the quoted author)?
   c. Do you understand why he or she chose the quote? Does the writer take the time to explain the relation between the quote and his or her own argument or does the reader have to figure out how the quote is related?
   d. Do you feel satisfied with the level of analysis AFTER the quote?
   e. Is each quote connected directly to either the point of the paragraph (check topic sentence) or the thesis of the paper?

12. Does the writer correctly format his/her in-text citations? Comment on where you see problems. Please review MLA formatting in LBH for help in determining whether the citations are done according to MLA style.

13. Is the Works Cited page formatted using MLA style? What changes need to be made?
**Purpose**

The purpose of this assignment is to allow you to critically consider peer review.

**Audience**

Your audience will be your instructor.

**Instructions**

Please write a reflection of your experience with in-class peer reviews. Organize your thoughts into a cohesive response memo. In addition to whatever information you feel is pertinent, be sure to address the following:

1. Discuss the value of peer response as it pertains to this project.
2. How did the peer reviews influence your revisions?
3. Evaluate yourself as a peer reviewer.
4. Discuss what you might do differently in your next peer review.

Please print out a copy of this assignment and submit it at our next class meeting.
Purpose

In addition to creating a conversation among scholars (you and your colleagues!), the purpose of this assignment is to allow you communicate with your peer reviewer in order to assist him or her in becoming a better reviewer.

Audience

Your audience will be your peer reviewer.

Instructions

Write a memo (letter) addressed to each of your peer reviewers evaluating their response to your work. Organize your thoughts into a cohesive response essay. In addition to whatever information you feel is pertinent, be sure to address the following:

1. What was the best piece of advice your peer reviewer gave to you? What things were helpful?
2. Share something you learned about your writing from your peer reviewer.
3. What specific changes did you make that your peer reviewer suggested?
4. Was there something your peer reviewer didn’t address that you wished s/he would have?
5. Discuss what changes you hope to see in the next review you receive from your peer reviewer.

Next, e-mail these memos to your peer reviewers. Then, print out a copy of each one, and submit at our next class meeting.