

Checkpoint 5: IWA Draft, for Peer Review

What to Do

For this checkpoint, students will produce a rough draft of their Task 2 Individual Written Argument (IWA). This 2000-word focused argument supports a claim from evidence accumulated in their research, inspired by at least two stimulus materials, and fully integrating at least one in the argument. Students enact, adapt, and revise considering their outlines from Checkpoint 4. As a reminder, these individual papers draw upon various well-vetted sources and assess the reasoning, evidence, and validity. They use the resources purposefully to support a perspective while acknowledging its limitations and the existence of other views that serve as counterarguments. Lastly, they are properly formatted, well written, and use consistent source attribution techniques (per teacher directive). Students utilize resources from previous and current modules' lessons, handouts, and presentations.

Once individuals submit their drafts, students will engage in a formal peer review activity, providing feedback on grammar and language conventions, organization and logical clarity, and strength of evidence. They may indicate areas where more information is necessary regarding concepts, definitions, or evidence to help warrant the reasoning. Once commentary has been added directly to the reviewee's draft, reviewers will respond to the following with specific details:

1. What is the central claim made in the inquiry? What is the established relevance (academically, historically, practically, etc.)? Does it do a good job of establishing relevance to the intended audience? Are there areas that need to be improved upon or clarified?
2. What perspectives are considered and ultimately advocated for in the paper? Is there strong support for the chosen view and acknowledgment of refuted alternatives? Are there any glaring omissions?
3. Do the resources do a good job of establishing the authority, credibility, or purposeful use of their primary and secondary resources?
4. Apply argument analysis techniques to the paper. Is the evidence sufficient? Is reasoning clear and valid, and is it warranted? Are there assumptions made that are problematic? What biases need to be addressed?
5. Does the draft acknowledge its own limitations? Are there any meaningful limitations not yet addressed? Provide help here.

For this checkpoint, students will have two submissions: their draft (submitted first) and the reflection of another student's draft (submitted second).