Read through the entire paper out loud. Take note of your immediate reactions as you read.

1. **Assignment**: Reread the prompt. Does the writer effectively address all of the requirements?  
   
   **Yes**

2. **Introduction/Conclusion**: Does the introduction grab the reader’s attention? Does it include a thesis statement that presents a central claim? Does the conclusion leave the reader with a memorable last thought that shows the significance of the analysis?  
   
   Great hook - holocaust reference. I like the thesis as well.  
   
   I didn’t think that the conclusion summed up how effective he was using his rhetorical skills.

3. **Development**: Does the paper contain sufficient examples from the text (quotes, paraphrases)? Is there any extra information?  
   
   Good quotes and examples.

4. **Development**: Does the writer go beyond simply identifying rhetorical techniques to analyzing how those techniques contribute to the purpose behind speech or his/her central claim speech? Is this evidence presented in a detailed, interesting way?  
   
   Yes. I like how you explain how he uses word choice to affect the audience.

5. **Organization**: Is the paper effectively organized? Does the writer provide the necessary cues for you to accurately predict what will come next?  
   
   Organization is not great (P#4 & 5 confused me)  
   
   I was not able to predict what would come next all the time. When you use (second, third, and in conclusion) it was hard to predict.

6. **Mechanics**: Will the style, tone, and types of evidence appeal to the intended audience? Does the writer provide correct MLA citations?

   Through your conversation with the writer, prioritize your feedback. Take note of what the writer did well as well as where there is room for revision. Together, map out a plan for revision on the back of this page. Remember to talk with me after each workshop session. If you have time at the end of class, you may choose to look at grammar, syntax, spelling, etc.