



Zimmerman Library, 3rd Floor
<http://caps.unm.edu/>

Brought to you in part by your UNM Student Activities Fees,
and by a U.S. Department of Education Title V grant.

Title of Paper: _____

Reader's Name: _____ Writer's Name: _____

PEER RESPONSE WORKSHEET

Answer these questions thoughtfully and carefully. **Also, think about whether your own paper has similar problems and/or successes as you find in the paper you review.**

- 1.) Summarize the writer's purpose in this document. (Is he or she persuading, arguing a point, reviewing, responding, proposing, etc.) Then, find and underline places in the text where this purpose is clear; draw an arrow next to places where you think this purpose should be clearer.

- 2.) No matter the writer's purpose, he/she will need to use support or evidence to achieve that purpose, be it supporting a thesis, analyzing a work of art, proposing a project, or reporting on an event. Does the writer use support or evidence to back up each claim?
 - a. If yes, describe a place where the writer does so successfully. What support or evidence did you find most effective? Why?

 - b. If no, offer a suggestion for how or where the writer might use evidence or support to back up their claims.

 - c. Does the writer draw clear conclusions from evidence, quotations, diagrams, tables, etc.? If no, describe a place in the paper where the writer fails to make clear "point-statements" or draw conclusions from evidence, quotations, etc. What was the result? Does the reader ever feel lost?

- 3.) Take a moment to compare this paper and your own. Does the author approach this assignment differently than you did? If so, how? Is there anything this writer did that you might try to apply in your own writing? What can you take away from this?

Introduction

<i>EXCELLENT</i>	<i>GOOD/COMPETENT</i>	<i>NEEDS WORK</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Opens in a way that would interest the intended readers. <input type="checkbox"/> Provides a “map” of the discussion to follow, highlighting or foreshadowing main points and topics that will be discussed in order to support the thesis or purpose.	<input type="checkbox"/> Makes clear introductory moves in order to identify the topic, although opening sentences are more functional than interesting to intended readers. <input type="checkbox"/> Background information (summary, etc.) is provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Suggests the shape of the discussion to follow.	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not identify (soon enough) the paper’s topic. <input type="checkbox"/> Is not mindful of interests and expectations of intended reader. <input type="checkbox"/> Does not prepare reader for discussion to follow, i.e. does not highlight main points, give background information.
Thesis		
<input type="checkbox"/> Thesis is strong and specific. <input type="checkbox"/> Thesis is tension-filled, (“Although x, it should be y because of z.”) <input type="checkbox"/> Thesis is arguable.	<input type="checkbox"/> Thesis is specific. <input type="checkbox"/> Thesis is arguable.	<input type="checkbox"/> Thesis is not identifiable. <input type="checkbox"/> Thesis is broad and general, not arguable. <input type="checkbox"/> Thesis lacks tension.

Organization

<i>EXCELLENT</i>	<i>GOOD/COMPETENT</i>	<i>NEEDS WORK</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> The content of each section is organized in a logical and effective manner. <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraphs are framed by interesting and effective topic sentences, which “open” into the succeeding discussion. <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraphs have support sentences to back up claims, and the logical placement of “point sentences” keeps the discussion clear and easy to follow. <input type="checkbox"/> Transitions between sections are easy to follow.	<input type="checkbox"/> The content of each section is organized in a fairly logical manner. <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraphs are framed by topic sentences that introduce the general subject of each paragraph, but in some cases could use improvement to “open” the conversation rather than state the topic. <input type="checkbox"/> Some paragraphs need “point sentences” sentences to draw conclusions and connect local discussion to the main or global purpose of the paper.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discussions do not follow a logical progression, e.g. discussion “skips” around, and/or is frequently repetitive. <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraphs lack topic sentences. <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraphs lack point sentences that keep the discussion clear and easy to follow.

Surface Features and Style

<i>EXCELLENT</i>	<i>GOOD/COMPETENT</i>	<i>NEEDS WORK</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Writer’s point of view, diction, vocabulary, phrasing is always appropriate for the rhetorical situation. <input type="checkbox"/> Free of systematic error patterns (commas, possessives, subject-verb agreement, etc.). <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and often eloquent phrasing.	<input type="checkbox"/> Writer shows awareness of rhetorical situation. <input type="checkbox"/> May contain some less distracting error patterns. <input type="checkbox"/> Writing is clear with only minor grammatical mistakes or the occasional awkward phrase.	<input type="checkbox"/> Writer’s point of view, diction, vocabulary, or phrasing shows unawareness of rhetorical situation. <input type="checkbox"/> Errors in grammar or spelling are distracting or impede communication. <input type="checkbox"/> Phrasing is unclear and often overwhelmingly awkward

Conclusion

<i>EXCELLENT</i>	<i>GOOD/COMPETENT</i>	<i>NEEDS WORK</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Clear signals that paper is concluding. <input type="checkbox"/> Restates main point in a fresh way. <input type="checkbox"/> Looks to the future, calls to action, or stresses the importance of topic.	<input type="checkbox"/> Signals that paper is concluding. <input type="checkbox"/> Restates main point.	<input type="checkbox"/> Closing strategy is not evident either because paper ends abruptly, or conclusions does not “wrap up” discussion, but introduces new ideas. <input type="checkbox"/> Writer does not restate main point or draw conclusions from previous discussion.