

APPENDIX B

PEER REVIEW INSTRUCTIONS*

- (1) Put yourself in the role of an educated and skeptical supervisor. Read the entire document once without making any notes or comments.
- (2) On a separate sheet of paper, write your name (as the peer reviewer), the name of the author of the document you are reviewing, and your answers to the following questions.
- (3) What are your initial thoughts and impressions of the entire document?
- (4) Read the Statement of Facts section a second time. Based on the facts alone, can you identify which party the author represents? Did the author use appropriate tone and word choice? Were you left with an impression of which side should win? Did the author cite appropriately (form and sufficiency) to the record?
- (5) Read the Argument section a second time, focusing on the organization and order of the points being made. Identify where the flow of argument is less effective, where points might be re-ordered, or where you see faulty logic.
- (6) Look at the topic sentence of each paragraph and comment on the relationship between the topic sentence and the content that follows, the clarity of the sentence, and its tone. In total, do the topic sentences direct the reader through the paper?
- (7) Discuss the author's use of authority. Did the author select the best authority to support his/her claim? Are there alternative or additional sources you would have chosen? If so, why? Have the cases/statutes been accurately described and synthesized?
- (8) Discuss the analysis. Are the conclusions explained sufficiently? Has the author developed the argument/facts rather than reciting them and leaving you to draw the desired conclusions? Ultimately, are you persuaded? Why or why not?
- (9) Note any other observations or edits (i.e., writing style, sentence structure, grammar, citation, and typos).

* This list is taken from Professor Seligmann's article, Terry Jean Seligmann, *Testing the Waters*, 15 Second Draft (Bull. of the Leg. Writing Inst.) 13 (June 2001).