

Peer Review #1: *Show them what they are saying*

Read through your peer's response paper and highlight whenever you see your peer doing the following:

Describing an element of a primary text (a film or piece of fiction) - be sure to identify two *different* primary texts in the response (perhaps noting 1 or 2 next to each as they move between discussing them both)

Closely reading an element of a primary text

Providing historical analysis of a close reading or description of a primary text (connecting an element of the primary text to the historical and cultural context from which it emerges/participates within). Mostly breaking things down (analysis) and showing your reader *how* you are thinking about history, culture, and the primary texts.

Making a claim about how the primary texts provide insight into their historical and cultural contexts (synthesis, or, bringing things together; telling your reader your point)

Integrating additional course materials through citation or paraphrase (not the film or piece of fiction central to the paper)

Put a *** next to moments you find interesting

Review what colors you see and in what order, frequency, and magnitude. Considering that the assignment (and course for that matter) is interested in how you connect primary texts like films and fiction to their cultural and historical contexts, do you think your peer should add more purple? Is their claim (green) present? Does the blue, yellow, red, and purple work together to make the green persuasive? Write one paragraph that summarizes both *what* you see in the color coding and what your peer should focus on most in revising this paper so as to best address the learning objectives of the prompt and course.

Peer Review #2: *Can they say more?*

Based on your color coding, pick one moment in the text you found to be very successful, that is to say, pick a moment that does a good job weaving together description, close reading, and historical analysis (or a moment that is close!). Based on what your peer wrote, explore additional directions they could go. Is there a course reading that might highlight or add depth/nuance to their argument? Remind them of it and explain how it might help them push their idea further! Is there an element of their close reading they should return to during their historical analysis that will make their claim really pop? Let them know! Essentially, bring more ideas (historical, analytical, or research-based) to your peer's paper. Write this note at the end of the paper, but be sure to note what moment you are responding to (For example, mid-paragraph on your third page, beginning with "xxxxx" and ending with "yyyy").

Complete the same task for a passage you found less successful. Clarify why this passage is not as persuasive or insightful or analytically rich, and give them some ideas of how they can develop their writing. Again, write this note at the end of the paper, but be sure to note what

moment you are responding to (For example, mid-paragraph on your third page, beginning with “xxxxx” and ending with “yyyy”).

When you complete both peer review tasks, please write one to two paragraphs that clarify both *what* you think your peer can work on in this paper (be as specific as possible) and *why* you think making these changes (either in writing or research or thinking) will benefit the paper. Please put the **what** in bold and underline the why.

Return your feedback and the original paper to your peer. Take some time to talk about the process with each other.

If time/homework, **Feedback Reflection:** Review the feedback you received from your peer. Based on their notes write one paragraph about what your plans for revision on. Be sure to cite your peer as you produce this text so it is clear where your revision idea is coming from. Feel free to disagree with your peer’s response as well.

Submit: Peer reviewed draft, comments, and feedback reflection to Moodle by ****Day/Time****