

## Reader Review Workshop- Writing Project 1

### **Stage 1) Reverse outline your own paper**

Read your own paper **out loud**- slowly and deliberately. For each paragraph, summarize **both** the central idea in the paragraph AND how the paragraph as a whole supports your overall aim for this paper. (Think about our discussion of McCloud and Bunn and the choices we make as writers). Write these on a separate sheet of paper.

### **Stage 2) Direct the feedback you want**

On each draft of your paper, indicate at least 3 specific sections (paragraphs, sentences, quotations, or ideas) on which you want feedback. Write down what your specific concern is with each section. (You can ask each reviewer to comment on the same 3 things or choose 3 different ones for each reviewer)

The more specific you are with what you want feedback on, the more direction your colleges will have when commenting and thus the more helpful their reviews will be for you as a writer. For example, “Does my introduction fully and specifically describe my purpose and topic? What is it missing?” “Does this paragraph make sense in relation to the rest of my paper?” “I’m afraid this sentence is too long but I can’t tell, what do you think?” “Should I expand on my analysis after I introduce this quote or is the point clear already?” “Are there too many ideas in this paragraph?” “Does the order of these sentences and/or paragraphs make sense?”

Also indicate if you want comments written in the margins, on the back page, or on a separate piece of paper.

Give each draft to one reviewer.

### **Stage 3) Reading and commenting**

- I. As a reviewer, read the paper out loud- slowly and deliberately. Reverse outline their paper: write down the central idea of each paragraph and how you think it functions in support of the paper’s central idea.
- II. Comment on the specific sections the author indicated they wanted feedback on. What is your impression as a reader?
- III. After addressing the author’s specific concerns, comment on the conventions of academic writing we discussed in class: Does the author provide sufficient textual support for their ideas? Do they need more examples to support their analysis? Is the purpose of the paper specific and clear in the introduction? Do the body paragraphs support that main purpose? Is the writing clear?
- IV. Write down any and all questions you have as a reader. What intrigues you? What do you want to know more about? What ideas or sections could they expand on that would support their purpose of informing and persuading the uniformed reader?

V. Lastly, read the paper again. Write down your reflections after the second read through. Is there anything that popped out at you, surprised you, or was clearer on the second read? Label these comments your “second reading observations”.

\*\*Repeat stage 3 for the second review\*\*

#### **Stage 4) Discussion and reflection**

Discuss each author’s draft one at a time. While your two reviewers are telling you their reactions as readers of your draft, listen, **without speaking** and take notes. After discussing the comments, move on to the questions each reviewer asked from section IV, and respond to your reviewers’ inquiries. Discuss any new questions/issues that have come up between the 3 of you during today’s workshop. Take notes on anything that is significant, interesting, or problems you need to address now moving forward.

Give all your comments and questions to each author.

Look at your original reverse outline and compare it with both of your reviewers’. Are there significant differences between any of these? Write any significant differences down.

Lastly, discuss and/or write down what you have to do next.

The submission draft is due Tuesday, October 11<sup>th</sup>. Good Luck!