**PEER REVIEWS**

**Instructions**

1. By January 29, [sign up](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/18grMYMWR7Y3mMVAiY1evxY9X3v55mAtMnbF-non50iw/edit#gid=0) to review one session this semester.
2. Within 10 days following that session, prepare two reviews, one for each presenter during that session, based on the following description.
3. Upload your reviews as two separate files to Canvas. I will score these and share them with the presenters for your session.

**Description**

This peer review gives you a chance to (1) learn from your peers and (2) provide constructive feedback. The course is designed to be an open-minded place to experiment with different approaches to presenting research and leading discussions, and these reviews can help to identify what worked from the audience’s perspective.

A good review has the following elements,

* A summary of the main content of the presentation and discussion. This ensures that you and the presenter share a common understanding.
* A high-level critique. This is your opportunity to highlight the aspects of the session that you really enjoyed and those that you think need improvement. For example, if there are examples that resonated with your, or if the session leader was able to use humor to encourage deeper discussion, then mention that. Or, if you found an argument hard to follow or slides difficult to read, comment on that too. The most important point is to be specific in both your positive and negative comments.
* Suggestions. Based your critique, do you have any recommendations for the presenter? What techniques have you seen in other settings that might address the concerns you surfaced in the critique? Or, if there was something that worked well but which could be taken even further, describe how you think it might work.

A typical review is 2 - 3 paragraphs (one per bullet point) of 4 - 6 sentences each.

**Rubric**

*Attention* (5 points): The reviewer has spent time to understand the work that is being reviewed. The review refers to specific design choices.

*Thoughtfulness* (5 points): The reviewer offers substantive, constructive feedback. Comments relate to specific aspects of the work and avoid any vague generalities.