Feedback Sessions

Establish a friendly, open atmosphere

First session

- Friendly introductions
- Briefly describe the peer tutor set-up
 - ("As I wrote to you, the point of this peer tutoring is...")
- Emphasize that no one is grading anything here
- Ask how they experienced writing the first draft
- Focus on biggest changes needed (claims in relation to "they say"), encourage total overhauls and risk-taking
- Prepare issues that all or most in your group have in common

Feedback Sessions

Second session

- Ask how it went: what was difficult, what went well
- Focus on whether or not they were successful in implementing changes & new insights that came up in the process
- Anything else that needs to be done to strengthen their arguments?
- "Where did this information come from?"
- Again: a summary of issues that most have in common (successful paraphrasing, maybe?)

SUMMARY I FTTFR

Hi Sara!

Welcome to LUMES. My name is Benjamin. I'm a 2nd year student and part of group who is providing peer feedback on pre-course assignments this year. I don't grade anything – just give response on your text to help you understand how a reader might respond to it. I myself wrote and revised a pre-course assignment last year....

Start with something positive!

What I found most compelling about your text was...(clear sense of purpose/great introduction/strong data interpretation/interesting topic selection/lucid langauge...)

I especially enjoyed...(the first paragraph on page 3 because it was really well organized, with its main point at the beginning followed by relevant evidence and explanations for that point)....

For this first round of feedback, we're focusing mostly on bigpicture issues especially related to making a meaningful claim and a coherent argument. With this in mind, I experienced three main aspects that you could work on for the first revision:

1) Reconsider the way you present your main claim. As I understood it, your main claim (that "....") isn't articulated until the very end, in your conclusion. Most readers prefer that the main claim be stated in the introduction of the text—it motivates them to read on by knowing what will be proved by sub-points and evidence later in the paper. It's often much easier to read an article that gives the big picture first, so readers understand how the details fit.

- 2) Look over sections 2 and 3. It was difficult for me as a reader to see what role they play in your overall argument. Section 2 seemed to describe X, but I don't understand what that description had to do with supporting your main claim. If you still feel that the reader needs this description, you can work on motivating the section with a good signpost in the beginning. Section 3.....
- 3) Consider the counter-argument(s) to your main claim. It's important to imagine skeptical readers and respond to their potential questions or concerns, as well as respond to literature that might disagree with your claim. You start to do this in section 4, but I think this is an opportunity to.... I commented in the text when I had a question or when you could address a counter-argument.

Please note anything that you have questions about, especially if there is something that isn't clear, and we will discuss at our in-person meeting on _____.

I'm looking forward to meeting you and discussing your text further...

All the best/Kind Regards/Best wishes/....
Benjamin

Remember, in-text response as a trained read comments editor (although you can edit in small doses).

"I expected something different after reading your introduction/the previous sentence..."

"I'm not sure what you mean here...."

"I needed a transition or clear connection between these two ideas."

"What are the implications of this?"

"Who would this benefit?"

Don't forget positive things: "Smooth transition!" or "Compelling evidence..."

NOT, however, "this is interesting/good."