**Peer Editing Workshop**

This is a handout for the peer-editing workshop. The workshop encourages students to think structurally and strategically about the process of writing and motivates them to think of writing as a dynamic process.

Writer: [name]

Reader: [name]

**Overview**

**(Directions for the reader and writer)**

1) (Reader) read through and mark-up text.
2) (Reader and writer) after you have finished editing the paper, tell the writer what you as a reader are finding in the text. Writer listens- no comments or explanation. (Written or orally is fine)
3) (reader and writer) Engage in dialogue (writer participates) that explores possibilities for refinement, expansion, focus, clarification. (Written or orally is fine)

**Reader reads it twice!**
1) (Reader) read the paper through once (quickly) to get an overview, making marks in the margin to specific points you want to comment on further.
2) (Reader) read a second time (more carefully). This time, comment fully on both form and content, following the below guidelines.

**Guidelines for the reader**

**Thesis, topics, objective, or main ideas and methodology**

* Identify the author's theme/argument/thesis/main idea/ objective. What is it? Is it a fact, an opinion or a thesis? Try to paraphrase it, after you have finished reading and marking the draft, tell the writer what you understand the argument/thesis/main idea/ objective to be.
* What topics does the writer discuss? Does each successive paragraph in some way support the theme/argument/thesis/main idea/ objective? If not, make suggestions that will enhance the cohesiveness of the argument.
* Does the writer connect her insights and argument to a greater textual context?

**Mechanics/Paragraphing**

* Mark grammatical and spelling errors by circling them, (but don't try to correct).
* Note sentence structure; does each sentence seem to convey a complete idea? If not, is it a fragment? If you think it is a fragment, write "frag" in the margin and underline the sentence.
* Does each sentence make logical sense? Does each sentence seem to follow in a logical sequence from preceding sentences? If not, write "logic" in the margin and underline the sentence.
* Is the material broken into paragraphs at logical points?
* Do the paragraphs each seem to lend support to the overall thesis of the essay?

**Organization**

* Does the writer follow a logical sequence of claims and evidence so that the paper is easy to follow?
* Do the paragraphs seem to occur in a logical sequence? Can the impact of the argument be enhanced by changing the order of certain paragraphs?
* Does the paper cohere as a whole? Do all the parts fit together in a clear relationship? Does the writer tie everything together with under a common thesis or through related themes?

**Evidence/Reasoning**

(Might not apply such as in a short story or script)

* Is there sufficient textual evidence to support each claim if needed?
* Does the writer argue effectively, using reason and logical explanation to contextualize quoted material?
* Do you "buy" the writer's argument, based on supporting evidence or reasoning?
* Does the writer use proper citation method each time?

**Introduction/Conclusion**

(Might not apply such as in a short story or script)

* Does the paper have a clear introduction?
* Is the conclusion satisfying?
* If not, make suggestions to help the writer formulate strategies for these two important features.

**Reader Comments**

* Use the back of this sheet to write a paragraph or two commenting on the paper. Be sure to:
1. List major themes as they are apparent in the paper and comment on anything you notice the writer habitually doing (for example, he or she may have a tendency to write long, tangled sentences that would work better broken into shorter sentences).
2. If you noticed a sentence that you have an idea of how to improve, rewrite it here for the writer.
3. Finally, be sure to comment on what the writer is doing right. Does he have a particular strength? A really powerful insight? Is his paper well organized? Good use of supporting evidence? Interesting discussion of findings? An especially well written phrase? Be sure to say so!