

On **Thursday, April 23** you should come to class with **two copies** of a full draft of your paper printed out (one for the peer editor and one for me). You should also prepare **two specific questions or themes** that you would like the peer editor to focus on.

During class, you will begin reviewing a classmate's paper. You should finish your peer-editing of the paper at home and hand in your comments in class on **Thursday, April 30**. To provide written feedback on the draft you're reading:

1. Read the complete piece.
2. Annotate the paper with specific comments and suggestions.
3. Write a one- or two- paragraph summary of your evaluation of the paper, focussing on constructive comments for improvement and addressing the two questions posed by the author before the editing process.
4. Sign your editorial comments.

As you read the paper, keep in mind the following criteria for evaluation of written assignments.

- Clarity of communication.
- Is the writing clear and concise?
- Flow of ideas: coherence and logic within the argument.
- Is the paper focused and organized?
- Is the writing proofread for grammar, spelling, and diction errors?
- Are the proofs correct, well-written, and elegant?

When you submit the final version of the paper, you must also submit the comments and edited draft from the peer-review workshop. Your editing of your partner's paper as well as how you incorporated the editorial suggestions into your own paper will be factored into your final project grade.

Grading scheme for peer-review:

(5 points) Clear and thorough comments throughout the paper highlight unclear areas and comment on positive components. Helpful suggestions and/or probing questions suggest improvements or direct the author to specific areas of confusion.

The summarizing paragraphs give a global picture of what work needs to be done and specifically take into account the questions posed by the author.

(4 points) Thorough review (see above for criteria) with summarizing paragraphs but less emphasis on author's questions or addressing author's questions but not summarizing feedback.

(3 points) Thorough review (see above for criteria) with no summary.

(2 points) Less thorough review.

(1 point) Very few comments or suggestions.

(0 points) No peer-review submitted.