

Guidelines for Peer Review: Document in Field Assignment

Your name: _____

Peer's name: _____

1. Please read your peer's Document in Field through completely. List below three elements of the Document in Field rewrite that you liked the most:

a)

b)

c)

2. What is your peer's "field"? In what journal did your peer find the article? Is the journal "scholarly"? How do you know?

3. Please address your peer's transformation of this article into language a general reader would understand. Did the peer effectively "summarize" the 200-word section? By this I mean, did the student stay away from analyzing and/or adding his/her own opinion? (It is OK if the student added some necessary background or contextual information – but this information *should not be* analysis of or opinion on the topic.)

4. Does your peer successfully render the "technical" language of the original article as language that is comprehensible to a general reader? Provide examples of instances you think your peer could still improve.

5. Do you think your peer's section headings within the memo are effective? How might they be improved to better communicate what is in each section?

6. Does the “body” section of the memo, or whatever it’s called, conform to the 500-word (approximate) rule for summarizing the original? Did the first section of the memo set you up for the body adequately? Did the “conclusion” tie up any lingering concerns you had?

7. In terms of structure/style/grammar, what are your peer’s greatest weaknesses? Does the peer use run-on sentences or poor paragraphing strategies? List your suggestions for improvement below.

8. What are your top three pointers for your peer during his/her final revision of this assignment?