WR39C: Draft 2 – Peer Response

Step 1: Read the entire project all the way through once without making any marks, without taking any notes, and without answering any of your questions. Engage with the text earnestly so that you can respond as an active representative of the generous, genuine audience for your peer’s paper.

Step 2: Record your experience as an active reader by responding to the following prompts:

* Describe the problem you see the author focusing on. (You can paraphrase the problem and cite the paragraphs from your peer’s paper wherein you found this information, or you can quote directly and cite accordingly. Additionally, star (\*) these moments in the margin of the original paper.) How does the author make the problem feel urgent and important?
* Identify the solution statement in your peer’s paper. Underline it, and quote it here.
* Then, comment on the following:
  + Does the solution address the problem in a specific, earnest, and plausible way? How/why or why not?
  + Can the solution be Mandated, Encouraged, Regulated, or Legislated? (Does it MERL?) How, by whom, and how effectively? (Draw an “X” next to the moments you see your peer author addressing these aspects of his/her solution.)
  + How will the solution be implemented, according to the author? (Mark with “#” signs.) What are the costs of the solution (monetary and non-monetary, but mark all with “$” signs)? Is it clear to you that the solution’s benefits outweigh the costs?
  + How does the author know the solution will work? (Does (s)he describe analogous contexts wherein a similar solution has worked? Does (s)he link the solution to the root causes of the problem? Does (s)he discuss the coverage area of the solution, and is it sufficiently large to make a difference to the problem? Does (s)he describe the metrics for success (how we will know that the solution is working)? Does (s)he compare his/her solution to other possible solutions and explain why that solution is better than the others?) In addition to paraphrasing them below, mark these instances with a checkmark on the draft.
  + How does the author address counterarguments? As a reader, are you satisfied with both the presentation of the counterargument (Does it seem realistic, earnest, and plausible? Is the opposition well-represented? Does the author effectively “deal” with the counterarguments presented by acknowledging, rebutting, or resolving the concerns?) Mark these places with a “C” on the draft.
* Describe your experience as a reader. Were there any moments wherein you were confused? Should the author consider reorganizing anything? Did you have sufficient context/background information as you read?
* Comment on your peer author’s **ethos** throughout the essay. Does (s)he maintain an effective tone, use credible sources well, incorporate effective multimodal elements, and seem in control of his/her prose?

Step 3: Describe the single greatest strength/achievement of this draft. Then, describe the one feature of the paper the author could address to most improve your reading experience.

Step 4: Sign and date this page below, and prepare to talk through your responses with your peer reviewer.

signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_