

Peer Feedback Process for the Presentation 1 Outlines

Prepare a feedback memo for the author of each paper, following the directions below. You will discuss each outline with the author in class, so you will have time then to expand on your written comments and explain them more fully. However, your written comments should be comprehensive to a reader (i.e., Asha).

Bring to class one copy of your feedback for the author, and one copy to give Asha.

Part 1:

Summarize the two or three greatest strengths of the outline as currently written.

Part 2:

Write short responses on the following eight topics. You don't need to elaborate in great depth on every topic. Although you should at least touch on all eight topics, focus your comments on a few topics where you think the writer could most benefit from focusing his/her revisions. Remember to mention aspects of the paper you think are particularly strong as well as areas for improvement.

You will likely want to supplement the memo with notes on the draft itself. Use MS Word's "track changes" and "comments" features to do this.

1. **Completeness:** Is the outline missing anything (e.g.: statement of core idea, purpose, and audience at the top; transitions; references as appropriate)?
2. **Purpose:** Will listeners hearing the speech understand exactly what the speaker wants them to *do*?
3. **Core idea:** Is it a precise statement and do you understand it clearly? Does the rest of the outline clearly support the core idea?
4. **Clarity:** Reading carefully through the outline, highlight any places where you can't easily and fully understand what point the speaker wants to make. For example, if line II.B. of an outline says "History" but gives no other information, you would note that the outline lacks a description of *what* about the history the speaker will say.
5. **Macro-organization:** Comment on the organizational structure the author uses for the main points of the body of the speech (chronological, geographic, etc). How effective is the structure? For example, is it intuitively logical to you? Does it seem like the best structure to convince the audience to take the action the speaker recommends?
6. **Micro-organization:** Comment on the organizational structure within subsections of the report. Is the organization intuitively logical to you? Does it seem like the best structure to prove the author's main point in that section?
7. **Transitions:** Has the author written clear, logical transitions between sections of the presentation?
8. **Persuasiveness and audience analysis:** Has the author chosen compelling logic, evidence, or examples to support the core idea? Is the speech well tailored to the specific audience?