Name of paper author:_____Daniel Miranda_____   Name of peer reviewer:_____Jonathan jones_____

PEER WORKSHOP EXERCISE

FIRST READ: Big Ideas

1. Write down your partner's two artifacts as stated in their essay. Also note (as briefly as possible) the

    (a) author (1) not stated. (2) Andrew Ng

    (b) audience (1)" researchers, industry professionals, and decision-makers" (2) Not directly stated but impleid to be for more common people.

    (c) purpose (1)" —a warning that businesses risk obsolescence if they do not adapt to the rapidly evolving technological landscape." (2) not as clear but I think its, "to demystify AI and make its benefits relatable."

    (d) Genre (1) peer reviewed thesis. (2) ted talk.

    for **each** of your partner's artifacts. If they didn't include these things, or you aren't sure what they are, note that here.

2. What was something you liked, found interesting, or something new you learned from this essay?

    Its not really giving information simply looking at the two artifacts in relation to one another. Its going over how they use rhetoric but not the actual information. It's a good essay for pure rhetorical analysis.

3. What do you think is the most successful part of the essay, or the thing that your partner did best?

    The second to last paragraph is good. The author already stated the difference of the artifacts but is now looking at how they both work to a common goal.

4. Were there any places in the essay that you were confused? Cite the page/paragraph numbers. (You'll try to explain *why* you were confused a bit later).

Not confused really just lack of clear statement of audience and purpose for the ted talk in paragraph three.

5. Do you feel like the essay effectively analyzed each artifact as through the lens of their research question/topic? Or did it seem to be dense with summary, or missing an important aspect of either artifact?

    The author does a good job of effectively analyzing the artifacts from a pure rhetorical point of view and then being able to demonstrate how it was used with the topic at hand.

SECOND READ: Close read

Introduction (might be multiple paragraphs)

6. Does the Introduction make the 3 rhetorical 'moves' (big picture situation, establishing the focus, and occupying the question or problem)? Do you feel like there is extra or unnecessary information they could remove or move somewhere else in the essay? Was anything confusing? Do you feel like they need to expand on anything here?

They establish the first 2 clearly but the last one is less clear. I believe they do but it could be edited from what they currently have to more clearly fit, "occupying the question or problem"

Body Paragraphs (might be organized by topics or headings)

7. Did each body paragraph have a topic sentence that gives you a clue what the paragraph is going to be about? If not, cite the page/paragraph number.

    Yes each one did.

8. Do you feel that each body paragraph connects back to its topic sentence as well as the framing argument outlined in their introduction? Did anything feel off-topic?

    Nothing felt off topic and each paragraph related to the overall point of the paper and the argument.

Name of paper author:_____Daniel Miranda_____   Name of peer reviewer:_____Jonathan jones_____

9. Did your partner effectively and explicitly compare & contrast their two artifacts? If so, was this done throughout their essay, or did they provide a separate section for it at the end? Do you have any suggestions for how they might better incorporate this section?

    Their current second to last paragraph is more on the comparison of the two artifacts with some contrast in the analysis of the second paragraph. They could expand on the contrast of the two artifacts within the compare section.

10. Did your partner's ideas flow well within paragraphs, and from one paragraph to the next? Do you have any suggestions to help them rearrange, reorganize, or clarify their ideas? For example, moving paragraphs, cutting a paragraph into two, cutting something to reduce repetitiveness, adding transitional words or phrases, adding topic sentences or sentences connecting back to the research question….

    Their ideas flowed in a neat and fluid manner. The paper felt short even though it is long simply due to its well-organized structure. The introduction flows neatly into the discussion of the two artifacts that then move into a comparison of the two.

Conclusion

11. Does your partner's conclusion effectively sum up their ideas, or give suggestions for future research? Do you have any suggestions to help them clarify or streamline their ideas?

    The author's current conclusion is a good start. It continues with a bit of contrast with a final on how each is working to spread a similar message. I feel they could add the first half of the conclusion to the previous paragraph or make it its own paragraph. Then expand on the rest of the conclusion in relation to the main idea and topic of the paper

OVERALL

12. If you could only give one suggestion to help your partner improve their essay, what would it be?

Indent the paragraphs to more clearly separate the ideas.