

**Your name:**

**Name of paper's author:**

Contact info:

Contact info:

Read each paper and fill out a copy of this sheet for each one. You will have the full class period for this workshop, so you can spend about half the period on each paper (*i.e.*, you should review at least two papers). If you do not finish during the allotted time, you are responsible for completing the work and returning it to the paper's author before the next class meeting (if you return it too late to help them revise, you will not receive credit for it). As you fill out the sheet, remember that your goal is to help your group members improve their papers. Note that it is not helpful simply to comment that everything looks good or to give only yes/no responses. If you have trouble thinking of helpful suggestions, try asking questions.

---

1. Does the paper's introduction identify the title and author of the work under discussion? Does it give any needed background or context? Does it describe the critical debate about the topic? If not, suggest what could be added. Does the introduction include any information that seems extraneous or that could be saved until a later section of the paper? If so, indicate what could be cut or moved. Does the introduction suggest why this topic and argument are significant?

2. Identify the thesis of the paper. Does it make a specific claim about an element of the work in question? Does it link that point to an interpretation of the work as a whole? That is, does it explain why its specific claim is important? If you can't tell from the paper what the writer thinks the work means, note that here.

3. Does the paper's thesis seem interesting, original, and thought-provoking? Does the thesis seem to be derived from one of the sources? Can you suggest any ways to extend the paper's argument or to make it more interesting?

4. Does the paper give specific examples and quotations from the work? Do these examples and quotations support the paper's thesis? Are there any quotations/examples that don't seem to fit in? Are there any places where more textual evidence is needed?

5. Is each example or quotation followed by explanation and analysis of a) how it relates to the point of the paragraph and b) how it relates to the paper's thesis? (Danger signs: two or more examples/quotations in a row, paragraphs that end with quotations) Are these explanations clear? Do any of them need to be more fully developed or explained?

6. Are there any places in the paper where the writer just seems to be summarizing the plot or just repeating what happens? Can you suggest where something could be cut or where more interpretation could be added?

7. Does the paper make specific references (either quotation or paraphrase) to the minimum required number of secondary sources? Is this material relevant? Are these sources being used to provide background? Are they used to support the writer's interpretation of the primary text? In other words, is it always clear how the writer's ideas go beyond or differ from the source's ideas? (This means that secondary source material should be analyzed, just as primary source material should be analyzed.) If not, identify where there's a problem and suggest revisions.

8. Is there a good balance between the amount of source material and the writer's own ideas? Does the source material ever seem to take over the paper? (If the source material is more than about a third of the paper, revisions may be needed.) Are there places where the secondary source material needs to be explained or analyzed further to emphasize the writer's own ideas?

9. Can you identify a clear and logical pattern of organization in the paper? Does the paper provide transition sentences that explain the relationships between paragraphs? If not, where did you have trouble following the organization?

10. Does the paper have a strong conclusion? Does the conclusion remind you of the thesis and leave you with a sense of why the paper's argument is important? If not, how could it be revised?

11. Is the paper generally well-written? Did you notice any consistent pattern of grammatical or stylistic problems? Is the tone appropriate for an academic paper?

12. Are all quotations and paraphrases correctly documented with a parenthetical citation? Is there a Works Cited page? Is the Works Cited page done correctly?

13. Did you find the paper's argument convincing? In other words, does the paper make a strong case for its interpretation? If not—or even if it does but could go further—make suggestions about how the argument could be strengthened.