The Peer Review Process
What is a Peer Review?

- A peer review is a formal review of a document produced by a colleague, fellow scholar, or expert.
- Peer reviews describe the strengths and weaknesses of a document.
- Peer reviews evaluate a document and argue whether it should be published or presented.
- Peer reviewers advise writers how to improve their document.
Why Have a Peer Review Process?

- Good peer reviewers are active members of their field and can determine whether a document is well-researched and accurate.
- Receiving the support of one’s peers and colleagues helps establish credibility.
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Why Have Student Peer Reviews?

- Students must learn not only how to edit their own work, but also the work of other writers.
- Students can greatly benefit from reviewing other work and identifying their strengths and weaknesses.
- Peer reviews offer students the benefit of seeing how their work affects a variety of readers.
- Peer reviews let students learn collaboratively. Peer review is a mutually beneficial process.
What Should We Include in the Artist’s/Author’s Note?

- Goal of the work. What is the creator trying to accomplish?
- What process did the creator go through? For example, number of drafts, how much time was spent? What was the artistic process? What tools were used?
- What is the context of this work? And how does it relate to other elements of the webpage?
Effective Peer Reviews are Polite, Specific, and Helpful

“I really enjoyed reading your essay. I hope you will find my comments useful.”

Address the document and NOT the author
Bad Peer Reviews are **Insulting**, **Ineffective**, and may have unpleasant consequences...

“How did you get into college? I’ve never read such crap. Did you graduate high school? This is the worst writing I’ve ever read!!!”
Good Peer Reviewing

An effective peer review has these characteristics:

1. General comments balanced by **specifics** — try to identify patterns of error

2. Descriptions of what is **effective** and **ineffective** about a document

3. **Specific** and **helpful** advice about how the weak areas can be improved
How Should the Author Respond to the Peer Reviewer

1. Concise summary of peer reaction to work.
2. Which elements of the peer-review are you incorporating into your work?
3. How has your work changed as a result of the review?