

Add at least one marginal comment

Focus on today's higher order concerns

- Does the paper have an arguable complex claim? What counter arguments or evidence have they overlooked?
- Can you, if asked, offer a one-sentence explanation or summary of what the paper is about?
- Does the paper match the prompt?

Guided Peer Review Questions for endnote. You do not need to answer these verbatim, instead treat them like jumping off points

1. What are your overall thoughts on the complex claim? Does this have all five elements of a complex claim? Which element is strongest and why? What could be improved and why?
2. Is the claim specific and arguable? What suggestions do you have for improvement or why do you think it's so strong?
3. Does the author present evidence for their claim? How does this evidence support the claim (or not)? Does the order the evidence is presented make sense?
4. Why does this claim matter? Does the author make it clear what the stakes are here?
5. Does the author provide a counter-argument/concession? What do you think of the counter argument/concession? Does it help strengthen the claim? Why or why not? Is it sign-posted with a transition word so you can tell it's a counter argument/concession?

Outcome 4

To practice composing as a recursive, collaborative process and to develop flexible strategies for revising throughout the composition process.

- o engaging in a variety of (re)visioning techniques, including (re)brainstorming, (re)drafting, (re)reading, (re)writing, (re)thinking, and editing;
- o giving, receiving, interpreting, and incorporating constructive feedback; and
- o refining and nuancing composition choices for delivery to intended audience(s) in a manner consistent with the genre, situation, and desired rhetorical effects and meanings.

What does the typical revision process look like for you? How long do you revise?

I didn't have much experience or opportunities for revision in high school because of how my classes were formatted, so I am not sure how I would approach revision. That being said, I would take the feedback given to me from my peers and try to fix what they mentioned. I'm not sure how long it would take me, but it would depend on the amount and severity of feedback.

I usually first create a rough draft quickly, and then I slowly revise to refine my paper. I also like to ask for help, whether from my teacher or my friends, to gain a different perspective on my paper.

I haven't often been given very useful feedback on my work, so I try to make sure my paper makes sense and put a lot of effort into my first draft. That being said, I sort of revise my work as I write it, and if I have time, I do set it aside for a little while so that I can come back and reread.

I will re-read/re-outline my paper to see if the draft matches my goals for the paper then make any extra revisions for grammar/structure. This takes a couple days, usually.

I revise very little, I try to put more work into the first draft so I don't have to change the structure of my paper during revision, only make small changes. Usually just reread it and fix any badly worded sentences and fix grammar/spelling.

Typical process for me is to reread my paper after a few days so I can see it from a fresh perspective. I look for paragraphs of sentences that might make more sense in other parts of the paper. Then I look for sentences that I should make stand out more since they contain more important information for my message. Next I look for sentences that do not matter or do not add anything that important and it would be better to remove them

Reread the paper and think about how to make it better. Peer review is also very important. Sometimes you even rewrite the whole thing. I don't usually revise immediately after I write it. It's better to give yourself some time, so you might have new ideas.

What do you struggle with during revisions?

- Having a lot of feedback made it difficult to keep organized and sometimes mixes up all my thoughts and can make the revision process very confusing
- I struggle with rereading because I find myself skipping over things a lot
Actually getting myself to change things ← Yes

After finishing a rough draft, I often don't want to ruin what I already have, so I don't like to change too much about my rough draft.

Taking the information from an objective standpoint and actually fixing the work. A outsider's perspective on flow and overall english is important to the entire piece.

I struggle with reading from an objective POV that is unfamiliar with the work. This limits me from making revisions for grammar or overall clarity/communication.

What advice would you give to others about revision?

- My advice would be to change the font, size, and color when revising because it makes it easier to pay attention and catch mistakes, then change it back when you're done
- At the very least you should reread the paper

Exercise 1: Cabral's Revisioning

- Follow directions on the last page

Exercise 2: Reverse Outlining

- Open up a new document. Copy and paste:
 - The complex claim from your introduction
 - The topic sentence and the conclusion sentence of each body paragraph
- Read the outline you've created. Then, think through the following questions:
 - Does each topic sentence clearly indicate what the paragraph is about? If not, how can you make that more clear?
 - Does the claim reflect what the body paragraphs prove? How can you add to or change the body paragraphs to better support the claim?
 - Do paragraphs build off one another? If so: Do you have transitions that show relationships between paragraphs? If not: Do you need to add a new paragraph or sentence to create the connective tissue between paragraphs?

Outcome 4

To practice composing as a recursive, collaborative process and to develop flexible strategies for revising throughout the composition process.

o engaging in a variety of (re)visioning techniques, including (re)brainstorming, (re)drafting, (re)reading, (re)writing, (re)thinking, and editing;
giving, receiving, interpreting, and incorporating constructive feedback; and
o refining and nuancing composition choices for delivery to intended audience(s) in a manner constant with the genre, situation, and desired rhetorical effects and meanings.

To me, outcome 4 is about understanding that revision is an ongoing and collaborative process. There's no such as thing as a perfect finish draft. And when we write, we're always engaging with other people's ideas, other versions of ideas, or other people's feedback. For example, when I revise I always ask a peer to read it because their outside perspective helps me rethink the problem I'm stuck on. =

Outcome Workshop

1. How would you explain this outcome to a 9th grader? Why is it important for writing? Use concrete + specific examples.
2. What could significant revision for this outcome look like?

Outcome One:

To compose strategically for a variety of audiences and contexts, both within and outside the university, by

- recognizing how different elements of a rhetorical situation matter for the task at hand and affect the options for composing and distributing texts;\

- coordinating, negotiating, and experimenting with various aspects of composing—such as genre, content, conventions, style, language, organization, appeals, media, timing, and design—for diverse rhetorical effects tailored to the given audience, purpose, and situation; and
- assessing and articulating the rationale for and effects of composition choices.

Outcome 1 recognizes the target audience and uses background facts and stylistic choices used by that target audience to curate a piece of writing catered for them. For example, the Lore podcast uses different aspects of language and overall presentation to properly explain the point they are making, and taking into account who their message is for, and what they'd like that audience to take away from the podcast

- Change the audience, change the studio
- Narrow the audience
- Change the language, tone, references for your audience
- Add more from the genre / medium

Outcome Two:

Work strategically with complex information in order to generate and support inquiry by

- reading, analyzing, and synthesizing a diverse range of texts and understanding the situations in which those texts are participating;
- using reading and writing strategies to craft research questions that explore and respond to complex ideas and situations;
- gathering, evaluating, and making purposeful use of primary and secondary materials appropriate for the writing goals, audience, genre, and context;
- creating a "conversation"—identifying and engaging with meaningful patterns across ideas, texts, experiences, and situations; and
- using citation styles appropriate for the genre and context.

Outcome 2 is about making connections between outside texts and your own writing. It involves using and analyzing quotes to compare different sources and foster a conversation between them. By incorporating different perspectives into your text, you add credibility. Using statistics or other interpretations of a work can put your writing in a wider context and create connections to the conversations your topic of interest is in. Rhetorical analysis

For an essay about one of the works we read in this class, revision towards Outcome 2 may look like spending more time discussing and analyzing other people's understandings of the text. Alternatively, drawing connections between multiple works and identifying parallels could reveal more about the consequences of the work.

- Adding sources
- Changing sources
- Adding rhetorical analysis
-

Outcome Three:

Craft persuasive, complex, inquiry-driven arguments that matter by

- considering, incorporating, and responding to different points of view while developing one's own position;
- engaging in analysis—the close scrutiny and examination of evidence, claims, and assumptions—to explore and support a line of inquiry;
- understanding and accounting for the stakes and consequences of various arguments for diverse audiences and within ongoing conversations and contexts; and
- designing/organizing with respect to the demands of the genre, situation, audience, and purpose

Outcome 3 is about creating a convincing argument which means putting specifics in the piece that is relevant to the intended audience like their goals. We need to address the other side's concerns in a way that strengthens our own argument and include a complex claim. The outcome tells us to create an argument around and for the people we are trying to persuade.

- **Knowing your audience**
- **Goals - stakes, making it clear why the audience should care or what they stand to lose if they ignore this**

Concrete example of this - your reader is skeptical, they're always critical - you would probably not trust an argument that refused to entertain different opinions - and that's why complex claims are important

- **Add a complex claim - claim, evidence, stakes, counterargument**
- **Do extra research on your audience to see what they find convincing and add that kind of evidence**
- **Make stakes relevant to the audience**
- **Strengthening the counter argument**
- **Add a diff counter argument**
-

Outcome Four:

To practice composing as a recursive, collaborative process and to develop flexible strategies for revising throughout the composition process by

- engaging in a variety of (re)visioning techniques, including (re)brainstorming, (re)drafting, (re)reading, (re)writing, (re)thinking, and editing;
- giving, receiving, interpreting, and incorporating constructive feedback; and
- refining and nuancing composition choices for delivery to intended audience(s) in a manner constant with the genre, situation, and desired rhetorical effects and meanings.

Outcome 4 explains that revising is not just little grammatical edits here and there but an ongoing process that takes into account feedback from other people and refines one's work to better address the points one is trying to make.

It is about taking constructive feedback in a manner that allows your voice to still be heard, yet in the process creates a more constructive argument that is more digestible for and tailored more towards your audiences.

Including reader feedback can point out logistical, structural fallacies that otherwise would go unnoticed by the writer (writer's fatigue).

Eg. You are writing an article about students living on campus for the Daily, and your friend, who lives on campus, says that the piece doesn't represent their experience. Outcome 4 would have you address why they believe that, and taking their critiques into consideration, and altering your piece accordingly.

- Getting feedback
- Reverse outlining
- Take a break