

Peer Review Worksheet for Essay #1
(this handout can also be found on the class website)

Peer Reviewer's Name:

Writer's Name:

Goal: Peer Review offers you the opportunity to provide and receive constructive feedback on the Rhetorical Analysis Assignment. The purpose of peer review is for you to help each other advance beyond the current draft toward the finished paper. Writing is never done in a vacuum, and peer reviews demonstrate the way in which all writing is social, part of a community dialogue, and subject to change based on the responses of the particular audience. There is a triangular relationship among writer, reader, and text, with each contributing to the balance of the whole. Peer reviews make this dynamic visible. At the same time, through peer reviews, you learn effective writing strategies to apply to future papers.

Advice: Don't focus exclusively on grammar and mechanics. Your goal is not to edit but rather to offer constructive and helpful feedback: use a positive, encouraging tone, explain why a change should be made, and offer suggestions for effective revisions.

First Impressions: What writing and rhetorical strategies work really well in this essay?

Feedback on the Draft:

1. **Title:** What do you think of the title? Is it interesting, informative, and indicative of the writer's stance?

2. **Introduction and Thesis:** Read through the introduction and assess the thesis (what you think the purpose of the piece is). Does the thesis make a clear, compelling, contestable interpretation about the use of rhetorical appeals in the visual text being examined? Explain your answer and provide suggestions as needed.

b. After you finish the essay, revisit this question and respond: Does the thesis encompass the entire essay? Note any areas of the essay that don't fit within the thesis.

3. **Argument and Evidence:** Is the thesis well supported in the body of the essay with specific visual. Is the checklist information well organized in paragraph form with topic sentences that match paragraph content, or does the essay read as if the writer is moving down a checklist? Make comments and/or suggestions as needed.

b. Does the analysis of the argument use the rhetorical terms we've learned in class? Within the writer's essay, circle a few terms we have used in class and comment below on the effectiveness of how the writer uses these terms. If terms aren't used in sections where they could be, note that in the essay.

4. Persuasion and Assessment: What areas in the essay do you find the rhetorical analysis most convincing? What areas in the essay do you find may need more evidence or explanation to convince? What can you recommend that would make the essay even more compelling?

5. Examine the paper's development: introduction, conclusion, transitions, and organization. Choose one element from this list and explain something your peer does well. Choose another element and explain how your peer could improve it.

6. Closing remarks:

A) What do you think the writer might work on for next time and why?

B) Your reflection: what did you learn from reading this essay that you did not know before, either about the text under analysis or about writing strategies in the essay?

7. Any additional comments or suggestions you might have:

Caution: As much as possible, avoid statements like, “Author X uses pathos to convince readers that...” Instead, be more specific and therefore more descriptive and analytical: “By incorporating this brief anecdote into an otherwise dispassionate, fact-based argument, Author X invites readers to empathize with a young mother and thereby appreciate the human cost of governmental bureaucracy.” **In another words, whenever you can specify a particular form of pathos, ethos, or logos, do so.**

Grading Criteria

I will evaluate: the strength of your thesis (both its arguability and its completeness, relative to the requirements outlined above), paragraph organization, the strength of your supporting claims, your use of textual evidence, the detail and thoroughness of your analysis (discussion of the relationship between author, text, audience, and context in conjunction with discussion of the author’s rhetorical strategies, including the appeals), the logical flow of the paper, and the mechanics of your writing.