**Assignment #1:** **Critical Synthesis**

Peer Review Worksheet

Alec Paul reviewing Skyler Fox

Since we are using Joseph Harris’s strategy of “coming to terms” to *rewrite* and respond to James Gee, Gloria Anzaldua, and/or Vershawn Ashanti-Young, I thought it would be most generative if we were to extend that frame to our peer review workshop as well.

That is, I want you to **COME TO TERMS WITH YOUR PARTNER’S DRAFT**.

Read through your partner’s draft a couple of times, and then do your best to answer the questions below.

**Define the project:**

* What seems to be of most interest to the writer?

The comparison between Gee, Young, Anzaldua. You do bring up the idea of a consistent form of communication in the beginning, but nothing after the comparison of texts. You do not have many personal comments, you only focus on comparing the ideas of the two.

* What idea(s) from Gee, Anzaldua, and/or Ashanti-Young do they seem to be focused on? Why?

All three writers say that users need to be writing in their own Discourse. Gee says good grammar is wrong, yet Young says translating Discourses is good. (Bad connection). Anzaldua says racial identity is self-identity, and Young says racial language is considered bad. Gee, apart from the other two (or at least Anzaldua), is a white male.

**Note keywords and/or passages:**

* Where does the writer move from the “global” (concept) to the “local” (example)? How? Is that transition clear?

This transition is in the third paragraph, when you begin to discuss human language, before any quotes are brought up. The transition is gradual but clear. From the idea of computers, you get slowly more specific until you bring up the ideas of the author.

* What passage(s) seem(s) most interesting to YOU? Why? How has it changed your thinking of these texts?

I like the comparison to computer technology, but the analogy goes off the rails when you begin talking about USB and iPhones. No one has brought up this idea yet. You also bring up a new idea about the comparison of race between the authors, and you do elaborate on your perspective. I have not heard many of us talk about the comparison of the backgrounds of the authors and would like to see that explored more.

**Assess uses and limits:**

* Does the writer offer (or maybe imply) an idea or concern of particular interest that you would like to hear more about in the text?

How do the arguments of the authors differ, specifically in what expected of people (paragraph 4) and what is your input? You should also elaborate more on the computer analogy, since that is close to home and a new analogy I have not heard. Also, give more detail on your thoughts about the different perspectives of the authors based on their background; that is an interesting and unexplored point. Finally, conclude your ideas.

* Does the author say WHAT informs and allows for their perspective? That is, do they explain the experience or values that have led them to take the position they have? If not, how might they do so?

You give little of your own background or perspective. You should discuss this, perhaps specifically when it comes to your background in computers and the analogy you made in the beginning of the essay. You can use some of your discussion posts.

Remember that you are trying to **DESCRIBE** what you see as a reader, **EVALUATE** how well the essay has responded to the prompt, and **SUGGEST** concrete ways to revise and improve the paper. Good luck!