Structured Peer Review Assignment

Adapted from: *Engaging Ideas: The Professor’s Guide to Integrating Writing, Critical Thinking, and Active Learning in the Classroom*, by John C. Bean, 2011.

|  |
| --- |
| **Exhibit 15.2 (page 297)** Classroom Procedure for Response-Centered Reviews |
| 1. Divide the class in groups of four or five. 2. The writer reads the draft out loud (or provides copies for group members to read on their own). 3. Group members are given several minutes to take notes on their responses –    1. Listeners divide their response document or notes into three columns headed +, -, and ?. In the + column, they note aspects of the draft that worked well. In the – column, they note problem areas and any negative reactions, such as disagreement with ideas. In the ? column, they note questions that occurred while listening, such as places that needed clarification or more development. 4. Each group member, in turn, explains to the writer what he or she found effective or ineffective, what parts were clear or confusing, and so forth. Group members do not give advice; they simply describe their personal responses to the draft as written. 5. The writer takes notes during each response but does not enter into the discussion.    1. The writer listens without trying to defend the piece or explain “what I meant.” 6. After each group member has responded to the essay, the next group member reads their essay. The cycle continues. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Exhibit 15.4 (page 298)** Classroom Procedure for Advice-Centered Reviews |
| 1. Divide the class into pairs, and have each pair exchange drafts with another pair.    1. If the class has an odd number of students, I have a pair of students exchange with a single student whom I consider to be a strong writer. 2. The two students in each pair collaborate to compose a jointly written review of the two drafts they have received. I ask pairs to create a written review of each draft, guided by the rubric. To sum up their reviews, I ask reviewers to do the following:    1. Write out at least two things you think are particularly strong about this draft.    2. Identify two or three aspects of the draft that are currently weak, problematic, or ineffective.    3. Make two or three directive statements recommending the most important changes that the writer should make to the next draft. 3. The pairs then return the drafts to the original writers, along with their collaboratively written reviews. If time and schedules permit, the pairs can meet jointly to discuss their reviews. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Exhibit 15.3 (page 297)** Judgment Versus Descriptive Questions for Peer Review |

|  |
| --- |
| **Judgement Questions**  Does the paper have a thesis statement?  Is the thesis clear (you know what they are trying to argue or claim)?  Is the paper clearly organized (you can follow their thinking)?  Does the writer use evidence effectively to support the argument?  Is the paper clearly written throughout?  How persuasive is the argument?  .  .  .  .  .  .  .  .  .  .  .  **Descriptive Questions**  In just one or two sentences, state what position you think the writer is taking. Highlight or comment around the sentence you think presents the thesis.  Make a brief outline of the paper in a separate document. Include the thesis, evidence, counterarguments, and other major pieces in the order you read them.  List the kinds of evidence used to support the writer’s argument (scholarly references, news media, blog, personal experience, etc.)  Which pieces or evidence are the strongest? Which are the weakest?  Highlight and comment on any passages you had to read more than once to understand what the writer was saying.  After reading the paper, do you agree or disagree with the writer’s position? Be specific on why you agree or disagree. |