

Peer-review by Renata Pascoe on Osher Amira-Marks

Essay#4 Rough Draft

Ad. 1 and 2 Rubric and end comments:

Criteria	Ratings
1. Background & Connection to <i>The Other Wes Moore</i> (5 pts) Does the introduction give relevant context from The Other Wes Moore and explain how the student's chosen support system arises from the themes in the memoir? Does it avoid plot summary and instead connect the context to the research question?	-The introduction does a great job of setting the emotional tone and introducing the topic of integrated support systems - However, be careful with the academic tone. The prompt asks for an analytical research essay, but you use first-person phrases like "Reading... made me reflect", "It encouraged me..." or "I will show that the other Wes's failures...". In this type of paper, it's better to remove the "I" and "me" to sound more objective. Instead of saying "In this essay, I argue that..." → "This essay argues that..."
2. Thesis & Topic Sentences (5 pts) Does the thesis answer this exact question? → <i>To what extent did street culture and systemic barriers shape the other Wes Moore's life trajectory, and how could your chosen support system have changed his outcomes? What should communities and institutions do to provide pathways to flourishing?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are topic sentences clear, specific claims that support the thesis?• Do topic sentences include transitions that guide the reader?	- Your thesis is excellent: "In this essay, I argue that, while individual and family choices influenced the other Wes Moore's path, his life was shaped much more by street culture and systemic barriers that restricted his opportunities from childhood. Drawing on research about trauma, inequality, and adolescent development, as well as studies on integrated support systems, including school support, therapy, and vocational training, I will show that the other Wes's failures resulted largely from an environment that offered survival rather than opportunity." It clearly takes a position that street culture and systemic barriers shaped Wes more than his choices. It also nicely previews the solution (integrated systems). The transition to body paragraphs feels natural. - All your topic sentences are excellent. They consistently make argumentative claims rather than just summarizing plot points.

	<p>- You also use clear transitions like “In contrast” and “Another major barrier” which make the essay very easy to follow.</p>
<p>3. Body Paragraphs: PIE Structure & Evidence (5 pts)</p> <p>Do the body paragraphs use the PIE structure effectively?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P — Point: A clear claim • I — Illustration: 2–4 well-integrated quotations per paragraph • E — Explanation: Strong analysis connecting evidence back to the topic sentence & thesis • Does the student use a mix of logos, pathos, and ethos? 	<p>- You have done a good job including the required number of quotations and your Ps are clear.</p> <p>- You nailed the PIE structure in this draft.</p> <p>- Every topic sentence clearly is umbrella of ideas</p> <p>- Every I contain 2-4 quotations per paragraph</p> <p>- Really good explanation in every E; you don't just drop quotes</p> <p>- “To Wes, Tony was a ‘certified gangsta’” maybe add a signal phrase before this citation?</p> <p>- Yes, you use a very effective mix of all three appeals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Logos: very strong; you use logic backed by research to prove that the other Wes's outcome was a result of his environment; the connection cause vs. effect is very clear ○ Pathos: you successfully don't show emotions writing about the other Wes; as I mentioned before, in an analytical essay avoid using your personal reflection (first-person statements in the introduction) ○ Ethos: You sound very professional; Make sure you include that reading in your references. It looks bad for your credibility if it's missing.
<p>4. Conclusion (5 pts)</p> <p>Does the conclusion offer a sense of closure, highlighting the student's main points and conveying how the recommendation might prompt further study or action?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the conclusion go beyond summarizing? • Does it answer the “So what?” 	<p>- You effectively synthesize the main argument that environment beats willpower without being repetitive. The line “Thriving takes more than trying harder” is a great summary of your main points.</p> <p>- You clearly meet the further action requirement by listing exactly what needs to change: safe schools, mental health programs, and vocational training. It leaves the reader with a clear picture of the solution, not just the problem.</p> <p>- Yes, you definitely answer the “So what?” question. You make it clear that this isn't just</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does it explain why this issue matters for real youth like Wes and what communities/institutions should do? 	<p>about Wes, but about a system that expects resilience from kids without giving them resources.</p>
---	---

Ad. 3 Annotate the essay:

Hi Osher! This is an incredibly strong draft with deep analysis. Your use of the PIE structure is excellent, and your arguments are very convincing. Because I cannot annotate the essay by clicking on "view feedback" I decided to leave you my comments in this form:

1. I noticed that “The Other Wes Moore” (the book itself) is missing from your citations list. Since it's the main subject of the essay, it absolutely must be included in the Works Cited.
2. The prompt asks for an Annotated Bibliography (I just have read that in the prompt...) – is that right, Professor?
3. MLA formatting: your paragraphs are currently in block format. Standard MLA requires indenting the first line of every paragraph and usually no extra spaces between them.
4. Like I mentioned in the rubric, remove the first-person references in the introduction. That will make the tone more analytical and authoritative.
5. Make sure to introduce the book fully, maybe here: “Reading “the Other Wes Moore” made me reflect...” on page 1. Also, introduce two Weses and establish which one is which.
6. Great job on the contrast between the two Weses!
7. It was supposed to be anonymous; remember for the future for peer-review submission to remove your name.
8. I noticed a discrepancy between your citations list and the essay text: two sources by Zhao and Garcia appear in your bibliography but I couldn't find any in-text citations for them.
9. In your introduction you state, “Having witnesses...”, but you never address that later in the essay. It is a loose thread right now. Either address it in the body or the conclusion, or remove it entirely.
10. Audience awareness: be aware of that in your final draft, because not everything would be clear to a “fresh” reader for example “redlining” - if you are not aware of racial discrimination from the 60s or 70s and certain parts of America, you would not understand the concept.
11. On page 3 “These early interactions...” even though the interactions described are all negative, I would still emphasize that these are “negative early interactions...”