

Summer 2017

Peer Review Writing Feedback

Monica D. Foust

CUNY Borough of Manhattan Community College

Follow this and additional works at: http://academicworks.cuny.edu/bm_oers

 Part of the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Foust, Monica D., "Peer Review Writing Feedback" (2017). *CUNY Academic Works*.
http://academicworks.cuny.edu/bm_oers/6

This Activity or Lab is brought to you for free and open access by the Borough of Manhattan Community College at CUNY Academic Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Educational Resources by an authorized administrator of CUNY Academic Works. For more information, please contact AcademicWorks@cuny.edu.

Peer Review Session for Application Paper #1 (*Babies*)

During this feedback session, your goal is to provide constructive feedback to your group members. In other words, the feedback you provide should enable your group member to strengthen their paper. During the session, focus on the aspects listed below. If you have any problems or questions, please seek me out.

Step 1. Make sure each group member (including the author) has a copy of the paper to be read.

Step 2. All group members (including the author) will read the paper silently. First, read through the paper.

Step 3. Group members will address the questions in the Peer Feedback Guide.

Step 4. Group members will share their feedback with the author. The author takes notes on the comments.

Step 5. The author can ask any follow-up questions about the feedback.

Step 5. Repeat the review process with the next author.

Question	Things to consider in your feedback
Does the introduction prepare the reader for the ideas that are discussed in the paper?	Was the introduction too broad? What were the main ideas presented in the paper (that the author could address in the introduction)?
Does the author include a purpose statement (that explain what the paper will be about)?	Underline the purpose. Paraphrase the statement. Is there too much detail? If so, what seems unnecessary? Is there too little information? If so, what else do you need to know?
Is the paper well-organized?	Did the ideas flow in a way that made sense? What could be different? Did the order of the paragraphs make sense? What could be different?
Overall, was the writing clear?	Was it easy to follow what the author was trying to convey? Put a star beside a section you felt was clear and easy to understand. Circle 1-2 sections where you had difficulty understanding what the author was trying to convey. Tell what is unclear and what might make it clearer.
Did the author clearly explain/describe developmental theory and concepts?	Put a star beside an example where the author did this well. Mark a section (1-2) where the author struggled with this, and make note of what is lacking.
Did the author make appropriate connections between theory/concepts and an example from the film?	Put a star beside an example where the author did this well. Mark a section (1-2) where the author struggled with this, and make note of what is lacking.
What are the take-aways from this paper?	Does the conclusion prompt you to think about that? Does the conclusion stray from the rest of the paper?

Peer Review Notes To: _____

From _____

Introduction	Purpose Statement
Paper Organization	Clarity of Writing
Description of theory/concepts	Connection of film to theory/concept
Take-aways	Additional Comments