

Dan Genzelev
Dr. Cooke
12/2/2016
Diary 3

Evaluating a Recent Peer Review Session

I worked with a new partner, Sophie Frostbaum (she worked with Nia on another one, so she wrote about her session with Nia), for the portfolio peer-review session. Due to the structure of the session, it was easy for both of us to contribute to the group. We were each given a specific set of questions:

1. **Are two areas of improvement mentioned? If so, what are they? How are they demonstrated?**

2. **Do the selected artifacts correspond to/enhance the accompanying text? How so?**

3. **Do the captions discuss the assignment visibly articulated by the artifacts?**
 - **How do the captions describe the ways in which the assignment facilitated improvement?**

 - **Are concrete examples provided?**

 - **Is idea development and the known-new chain evident on the sentence level and as a mode of connecting the caption/artifacts to previous and following artifacts/captions?**

We decided the best way to ensure each person received beneficial feedback was to explain the larger concepts for our portfolio and our visions for how our final projects will look. After establishing this context, I handed my exhibit over to Sophie, and she did the same. The idea was that now, knowing each other's visions, we would be able to assess the execution and progress more thoroughly. I believe our method of tackling the peer-review session was successful, since it produced valuable feedback on both ends. Our respective portfolios were in two entirely different stages: mine was more focused on detail, while Sophie's was more geared toward her big-picture vision. I discussed specific instances in multiple assignments to demonstrate exactly how I have improved, but I lacked an introduction and an overview of my weaknesses. In contrast, Sophie included the overview and posted pdf's of the assignments she plans on discussing, but she did not mention concrete areas of the assignments. These differences proved to be beneficial, since she could provide me feedback on the grand scheme, and I was able to do vice-versa. I would say we contributed equally.

Despite being partners for the first time, our communication was efficient and productive. We respected each other and understood that negative comments were not personal attacks in any way, but rather constructive criticism that is needed in order to improve our portfolios to their maximum potentials. Likewise, we constantly gave each other encouraging praise for aspects of the project that we believed the other executed well. The only aspect of our communication that I would say was not perfectly smooth were the last five minutes of the session: we were rushing to complete the questions and send the email out instead of talking to each other. However, I believe the session was comprehensive and helpful.

Since Sophie did her diary entry on her session with Nia, I will set my own goals for my next peer-review session:

- 1) For my next peer review, I might ask to submit the email to Professor Cooke by midnight that day, so we can focus on the review for the entire class period and avoid the last-minute rush.
- 2) I want to come to the next peer review with specific questions about my portfolio. An example of a specific question I will definitely ask is, “what do you think of the way I’ve structured my portfolio? Do you think it would be more logical and/or aesthetically appealing to organize it another way?”
- 3) I want to have direct quotes from my assignments rather than just descriptions of how I improved in each. Then, I could ask my partner for his/her opinion on whether what I selected is actually consistent with the writing errors I have been focusing on.