

FOUN1014 Self-Review Guidelines and Activity – First Draft - SRP

Now that your team has completed the first draft of your SRP, **each team member** will review it **individually**. Here are the guidelines:

1. Read through the draft of your team's SRP.
2. Make note of the paper's main strength(s) – use the questions below [at 3] to guide you. Make relevant comments.
3. **Think** about the aspect of the draft about which you feel most uncomfortable and select the **ONE** question **that relates to YOUR concern about your team's paper** from the following:
 - Does the body of the paper develop the thesis statement?
 - Is there a clear link between the narrowed topic, thesis statement and the body paragraphs?
 - Does the paper have clearly stated main points and enough supporting details and evidence?
 - Is the evidence provided appropriate for purpose, audience, and thesis?
 - Is the evidence explained/interpreted for the reader?
 - Is the writer's voice clear or do the sources (incorrectly) dominate the paper?
 - If the paper is too long, what could be deleted to get closer to the word limit?
 - If the paper is below the word limit, what could be added to get to about 1500 words?
4. Bearing that question in mind, as you read through the draft a second time, **write comments** which should **link to the question** selected [at 3], indicating how inadequately you think your team has written in that particular area of the draft and how this can be addressed.
5. **The task:** Using the **comments you wrote [at 2 and 4]** as a guide, **write three paragraphs** in which you: a) identify [with explanation and/or examples] the major strength of your team's paper; b) identify **one** aspect of the draft about which you are most uncomfortable – [based on the **one question selected from those at 3**] - describe your concerns, and c) **outline how you think your team should improve** this aspect of the paper.

N.B. This is the first part (page 1) of your Self- and Peer-Review

FOUN1014 Peer-Review Guidelines and Activity

The peer-review activity will help you to identify strengths and weaknesses in your writing and in your peers' work. This aspect of the writing process will provide you with additional perspectives as well as suggestions and ideas for revisions, which have the potential to enhance the quality of your drafts. Additionally, this activity will help you to read texts, in general, more critically. Consider this the testing phase in the process of designing your research paper.

Guidelines for Offering Feedback:

- Your task, as reviewer, is to constructively critique your peer's first draft and, where possible, offer suggestions. **Corrections and editing are to be done by the writers of the first draft.**
- Offer a meaningful critique, using well-chosen, specific details as evidence; do not write a summary.
- Be considerate and as helpful as possible.

Guidelines for Writers:

- Take notes while your peer is critiquing your paper; even suggestions that do not seem appealing while your paper is being reviewed may turn out to be more helpful when you reflect on them later as your team is rewriting.
- Ask your reader questions and use only the suggestions that seem right to you.

Activity:

1. Write your name, your peer's name and his/her team number at the top of the page.
2. Read the first draft of your peer's SRP analytically, examining content and organization. Consider **aspects of the draft** including:
 - ✓ **Organization:**
 - Is there a clear thesis statement which indicates the writers' focus and main idea?
 - Are the sentences and paragraphs ordered effectively?
 - Is each paragraph unified, cohesive and adequately developed?
 - Do the sentences and paragraphs have a clear purpose?
 - Are transitions used to establish relationships between ideas?
 - ✓ **Development of the main idea:**
 - Does the paper stay on topic or lose focus at any point?
 - Do you feel you have learned something new?
 - ✓ **Support:**
 - Is there enough evidence to support the main idea?
 - Is all the evidence in each paragraph relevant to the topic sentence?
 - Is there sufficient analysis?
 - ✓ **Style and format:**
 - Is the writing concise and easy to read?
 - Is the language appropriate for the intended audience?
 - Does the writer use sub-headings appropriately?
 - Does the writer follow proper APA documentation format?
3. Complete the following tasks in **FOUR short paragraphs**:
 - Write a brief introduction in which you **identify the topic** of your peer's paper and state the purpose of your review?
 - Identify TWO strengths of the draft (see **aspects** above; use specific details from the paper).
 - Identify TWO weaknesses of the draft (see **aspects** above; use specific details from the paper).
 - Make TWO recommendations for improving the paper (based on weaknesses identified).

N.B. This is the second part (page 2) of your Self- and Peer-Review

Rubric for Self- and Peer-Review – (5%)

A 5.0 4.0 3.75	Excellent	<p>Self-review paragraph clearly and analytically identifies strength, weakness and outlines how the team should improve the paper. Peer-review includes a brief introduction which clearly states topic and the purpose of the review; identifies two strengths and two weaknesses using appropriate examples; makes two meaningful/insightful recommendations for improving the paper. Paragraphs are focused, unified and coherent; excellent language skills with virtually no errors.</p>
B 3.7 3.5 3.0	Good	<p>Self-review paragraph clearly identifies strength, weakness and outlines how the team should improve the paper. Peer-review includes a brief introduction which states topic and the purpose of the review; identifies two strengths and two weaknesses using appropriate examples; makes two recommendations for improving the paper but these may not be very insightful. Paragraphing is good though there may be minor issues with coherence and unity; good language use with only occasional lapses in grammar and mechanics.</p>
C 2.95 2.75 2.5	Satisfactory	<p>Self-review identifies strength, weakness and outlines how the team should improve the paper but may lack clarity in some sections. Peer-review includes an introduction but the purpose and focus may be unclear; identifies two strengths and one weakness or one strength and two weaknesses without using examples; recommendations for improving the paper are not insightful. Paragraphing is acceptable though there may be some issues with coherence and unity. Language errors are evident but are not pervasive.</p>
F 2.45 1.95 1.45	Unacceptable	<p>Self-review or peer-review has been omitted. Reviewer merely summarizes aspects of the papers; does not present an analytical review. Does not include an introduction, identify strengths and/or weaknesses or make recommendations. Recurrent grammatical errors and inappropriate language use.</p>