

PEER REVIEW STRATEGIES

1. TO OFFER BROAD FEEDBACK

Exchange drafts with a partner and implement the following 3-step process for each other's work. Take notes on a separate sheet of paper, working to answer these questions:

1. *Observe*: What did you notice about the paper? What was most memorable? Did you notice any patterns in the writer's work? If so, what? What was the writer's purpose, or what question was s/he trying to answer?
2. *Evaluate*: Did the writer accomplish their goal? Why or why not?
3. *Prescribe*: What would you suggest that the writer revise in order to better reach their goal? Is there anywhere in the paper where they did this more successfully? If so, could this be used as a model to improve other sections? If you decided that the writer did accomplish their goal, is there anything that you think would make the paper even stronger? Was there any part that made you curious to know more?
4. **Write a short letter to your partner summarizing your observations, evaluations, and recommendations.**
5. Share responses.

2. TO RESPOND TO A WRITER'S SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

1. Look over the below list of questions, and circle the two or three questions you would most like for your peer reviewer to focus on, as they read your work.
2. Exchange drafts with a partner.
Read your partner's draft with the purpose of answering his/her selected questions about his/her own work. Take plenty of notes as you read.
3. **Write a short letter to your partner summarizing your observations, evaluations, and recommendations.**
4. Share responses.

Potential questions I want my partner to answer about my paper:

- What is the main idea of this paper?
- Is my argument clear, and if not, where could I clarify?
- Did my language at any point confuse you? Where?
- What were two strengths you observed about my paper? Two weaknesses?
- Where do you think I could expand my ideas?
- Are there any words or sentences that seemed vague?
- What remaining questions are you left with after reading?
- Do I provide enough evidence to back up my claims, and if not, where could I incorporate more evidence?
- Were there places in the paper where you were intrigued but wanted to know more?
- What sources are being used and do you understand the purpose of these sources? Are there places where I should incorporate additional sources?
- What happens/is explained in the paper as you see it? Can you summarize this for me?

3. TO SEE IF A PAPER FOLLOWS GUIDELINES

1. Take out your paper, as well as any other information you have about your final reader's expectations: your assignment, prompt, paper guidelines from your syllabus, or a rubric your instructor has provided. Exchange your paper and guidelines with your partner.
2. Read the guidelines for your partner's paper. Take note of what is important for the paper and its audience: the explicit and implicit expectations.
*If there are no guidelines or rubric, look at the sample rubric, underlining questions and categories that seem especially important for the genre of this assignment (i.e. thesis for an argumentative paper, audience for a business memo).
3. Read your partner's paper, taking plenty of notes.
4. **Write a letter addressing what kind of revisions could help the paper more fully address the guidelines.**
5. Share responses.