Flavors of Peer Review
TEACHERS’ LOUNGE, OCTOBER 11, 2017

Response-Centered Review
Process-oriented, no advice. Reviewed student can receive contradictory feedback, and is responsible for making decisions about what to change.

POSSIBLE PROCEDURE

1. Divide class into small groups.
2. One student reads draft out loud or distributes copy of work to the rest of the group.
3. Group members write out their responses.
   (+) aspects of draft that worked well, provoke agreement
   (−) problem areas of draft that prompt disagreement
   (?) places in draft needing clarification or elaboration, questions that occurred
4. Group members take turns explaining to student what they found effective or ineffective. This is case as their personal response: no advice for revision is provided.
5. Writer silently takes notes during each response. No defending or explanation.
6. After everyone has responded, shift to a new student distributing work to the group members.

ENCOURAGING DESCRIPTION VS. JUDGMENT
To facilitate a truly response-centered review, discuss the difference between these sets of questions and emphasize that you want students to draw from the ‘descriptive’ column:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgment</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the paper have a thesis statement? Is the thesis clear?</td>
<td>Briefly state what position you think the writer is taking. Highlight the sentence that you think presents this paper’s thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the paper well organized?</td>
<td>Make an outline of the paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the writer use effective evidence to support the argument?</td>
<td>List the kinds of evidence used to support the argument. Which pieces of evidence are strongest? Which are weakest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the paper clearly written?</td>
<td>Highlight passages that you had to read more than once to understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the argument persuasive?</td>
<td>After reading the paper, do you agree or disagree with the writer’s position? Why or why not?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advice-Centered Review
Product-oriented, directive. Peer reviewers could collaborate to give advice to writer. Works best with criteria or rubrics.

POSSIBLE PROCEDURE

1. Group class into sets of four, and have pairs exchange drafts with another pair.
2. Students in each pair collaborate to compose a jointly written review of the two drafts they’ve received, ideally guided by a rubric provided by the instructor.
   (+) At least two things that are particularly strong about this draft
   (−) At least two things that are currently weak, problematic, ineffective
   (√) Two or three directive statements recommending the most important changes that the writer should make for the next draft
3. Pairs return drafts to original writers, along with collaboratively written reviews. Time permitting, pairs discuss reviews as a group.

Material on this handout is taken from (with light adaptations):