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TEACHING CYCLE 2:
IMPLEMENTING PEER FEEDBACK IN PART ONE WRITING MODULES

CONTEXT
A crucial feature of the creative writing seminar is the ongoing provision of feedback on students’ writing, with a view to their revising and editing the work toward submission for assessment. The most conventional “workshop” procedure is a round-table discussion of the work, which has been photocopied and distributed beforehand. Usually the writer is asked not to contribute to the discussion until the end, but to make notes of any comments which they deem helpful or pertinent. While this can be very effective with a group of experienced writers, it presents a real challenge to novice or under-confident writing students. This was the most significant issue raised in the mid-term review described in Teaching Cycle 1.

PROBLEMS
1) Students are at best tentative, and at worst prohibitively afraid of hurting their peers’ feelings: they feel they ‘don’t have the right’ to ‘pull other people’s work apart’ and tend to make only positive, but subjective and critically unsophisticated comments, such as ‘I really liked,…’ ‘I think it’s really good that you…’ ‘my favourite bit was…’ etc.
2) All comments tend to be directed through the tutor, as though s/he has to corroborate the observation, or offer the final word in any debate.
3) Unless the tutor intervenes regularly, students tend not to receive much critically useful feedback on their writing, and may not bother to re-draft.
4) Covering everyone’s work each week can be tremendously time-consuming and the routine a little monotonous.
5) The more confident students tend to dominate discussion while others sat silent.

FIRST STAGE INNOVATION: Editorial Boards
Structuring and optimising peer feedback is a perennial challenge for the writing teacher, and one which I sought to address in the ‘Poster’ component of the Induction Course in September 2000 (see Section 2, Induction Workshop Assignments). The aim of the innovation was to enable students to treat feedback as an objective or “professional” rather than subjective issue: to devise their own evaluation criteria in small groups, and to discuss each others’ writing using the critical vocabulary. They would then compile brief “editorial reports” which each writer could then take away to reflect on when they revised the work for assessment.

REFLECTION
For the poster exercise I had a relatively advanced level 2 or 3 module in mind, and was assuming a degree of critical sophistication in 2nd or 3rd year English students. Year One students, however, are just beginning to acquire the lexicon of textual analysis, and cannot realistically be expected to have the “professional” vocabulary with which to discuss the work as “literary editors”. Indeed, a large part of the task at
this stage would be enabling them to translate their initially subjective responses to each others' work (I like/ don't like x y and z) into the more useful terms of textual analysis (why? What is it about the way the piece is written that makes x y and z effective, or not? How might it have been accomplished more effectively?). It transpired that students needed a lot of prompting away from the default position of "I like/ I don't like"; a situation which meant that I was making regular interventions and students were feeling even less confident in their observations. In an attempt to remedy this, I tried three further forms of feedback strategy with a Part One group:

SECOND STAGE INNOVATION: Three Types of Feedback.

I. The Guided Round-Table Discussion:
Everyone reads their work aloud, and copies are also distributed. Discussion takes place through an open forum, but a simple checklist allows students to focus their commentary on formal and technical aspects of the writing (see appendix 2.1). Common problems or strong points are then drawn together in a whiteboard discussion at the end.

II. Devolved Sub-Groups
Students form groups of four or five to discuss their work, which is read aloud first. Each group is assigned a chairperson, whose job is to allocate time fairly between all participants, keep the discussion focussed (using the checklist where necessary) and make notes of the key points for the collective whiteboard discussion at the end.

III. Feedback Forms
Work is read aloud, then multiple copies placed in the centre of the table. Students can choose to attach a cover-sheet qualifying the intentions of their own piece and requesting particular kinds of feedback (see appendix 2.2). Each student then takes another's work and reads it closely, before completing a feedback form which follows the categories outlined in the checklist (see appendix 2.3). This is then clipped to the piece, which is returned to the pile, and a fresh one taken. Students then contribute key points to a concluding whiteboard discussion, and can keep the completed feedback forms to use in making revisions.

Common to all of these formats is the reading aloud of work at the start of each session, and the whiteboard session to conclude.

Reading work aloud is recognised by both practitioners and teachers of writing as an invaluable reflective device—and one which frequently enables students to recognise and solve their own problems even before receiving feedback from others. Writer and teaching innovator Peter Elbow describes this process beautifully:

When student writing is tangled and dead and without audible voice, we can easily get the student to see the problem—or rather hear the problem—and break through to audible voice. If we get the student to read the prose out loud, he can usually hear the tangle with his hear or feel it with his mouth. Often he stumbles. Or we can read it out loud ourselves or have someone else read it. The student can usually hear the deadness with his ear. Then we can ask, "How would you say it? Tell me what you are getting at!" and usually he cuts through the tangle to clearer direction, stronger syntax, and sometimes
better thinking. (All this, note, without “teaching” or advice). (Elbow 2000, 226)

The whiteboard session is a chance to pool and digest experiences of both writing and offering critique, and to draw out the conceptual frameworks which the writing exercise was designed to illustrate. The whiteboard comments are usually organised under three headings: 'Strengths', 'Problems/Room for Improvement' and 'Crap Detector'. The first two are self-explanatory and tend to be quite task-specific, while the 'crap detector' is a light-hearted but significant list of pitfalls which students agree the writer should avoid in all circumstances, e.g. rhyming 'love' with 'dove', waffling, confusing or boring the reader, relying on clichés, etc. Quite often the same things end up on the whiteboard week after week, but this reiteration seems to me an important pedagogical strategy. In the first instance, it shows that something the students learned the week before about plotting short stories, for example, may hold equally true this week for another skill, such as writing dialogue. This engenders a sense of cumulative learning and gives students more confidence in their expanding repertoire of skills. Moreover, most of the conceptual points to be made, e.g. that the opening of a story must contain a 'hook' or unanswered question to draw the reader in, are axioms one might read in any 'How To Write' textbook, but which only really become personally meaningful through the practical experience on which students are now drawing in the discussion. Central to all aspects of this process is students' core desire to be better writers, and this motivates practice and reflection in a dynamic which, rather than occurring cyclically or sequentially, seem more aptly described by Phil Race's (1993) 'ripple' model of learning, below:

(http://www.lgu.ac.uk/deliberations/eff.learning/happen/html 3)

The whiteboard discussion is, hopefully, a point which pulls together the learning from practical experience which mediates in ‘ripples’ between students’ internally
motivating desire to be better writers, and the external affirmation of feedback from others.

REFLECTION: STUDENTS
Following the trial of all of these feedback strategies, I asked students to offer their own feedback on the relative merits and drawbacks of each process, and to make any suggestions of their own (see appendix 2.4). A digest of their responses follows:

I. Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback in a large group:
- This can be embarrassing for the writer, but it is fun and instructive to hear everybody else's writing.
- Students feel 'safer' in a large group.
- Reading aloud makes it easier to spot problems with the writing.
- The wide range of responses is useful and leads to some interesting debates.
- It can be difficult for the writer to take on board all the comments.
- People can comment freely as they wish, without having to follow a rigid format.

II. Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback in smaller sub-groups:
- This is less embarrassing or intimidating for the writer.
- More pressure is placed on the others to comment.
- It is more difficult or, conversely, more comfortable to offer opinions in a small group.
- It is more relaxed and student-led.
- Fewer pieces can be covered in greater depth.
- It is a shame not to hear everybody's work.

III. Reading work aloud, completing written feedback forms in class:
- It is easier to be honest when offering written feedback.
- Students can read and respond in their own time.
- Feedback is more detailed and specific.
- People are working on their own and it isn't very sociable.
- Feedback tends to get repeated, and there is no room for debate.
- The format is useful, but it can be difficult to complete all the sections.
- It is more labour-intensive than spoken feedback.
- Having written feedback to take away is really useful.

Students' own suggestions:
- Photocopy and distribute a few pieces to discuss each week instead of covering everyone's work every week.
- Structure whole-group response so that each person offers what they found effective, what they found unsuccessful, with time for open discussion or debate at the end.
- Combine spoken feedback with written so that participants can take comments away for further reflection.
REFLECTION: TUTOR
The students' comments were very helpful, and their own suggestions will help me to refine this process. I was pleasantly surprised that they didn't complain about the time that feedback takes, and heartened by their genuine interest in each others' work and willingness to try different modes of feedback. Overall, we conceded that there is no ideal format, but that variation keeps a necessary process lively and engaging. It is also likely that some modes of feedback suit certain writing tasks better than others: e.g. longer pieces would be most efficiently discussed in small groups, while poetry might more closely be appreciated through written feedback.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT
Blackboard, the university's online learning environment, could usefully be deployed in this context. The online discussion board would be an efficient (and eco-friendly) way for students to circulate problems, ideas, and brief extracts of their writing for other students' feedback between seminars. It also has the advantage of allowing them to read and respond in their own time, and needn't be group-specific. This is something I will definitely try in the next academic year.

It might also be helpful to use the marking criteria in the Student Handbook (see appendices 2.5 and 2.6) as a way of structuring in-class feedback of students' writing. This would familiarise students with the criteria by which their work will eventually be assessed, and give them a deeper and more concrete understanding of how the criteria translate into practice.
Workshopping the Writing:

In small groups you will read your piece aloud, then receive constructive practical feedback from the rest of the group. Try not to 'defend' or explain your writing during this part: it is helpful to know how your writing would be received and interpreted without your own explanation. The purpose of this process is to make your writing the best it can possibly be.

Things to consider for feedback:

**Content:** Does the writing draw you in right from the opening line/sentence? Should the beginning be more immediate?
Are you interested in the character/s? Is there a strong enough sense of personality or voice? Do you care what happens? (You should—even if you don’t like the characters).
What happens? Is there enough change or development; is there enough at stake?

**Form:** Is there a recognisable genre or form? Is it the most appropriate one for the treatment of the subject?
Does it employ the most effective perspective?
Does it begin, develop and end in the most effective place? Should it be structured differently?

**Style:** Is the language fresh and original? Is it accurate? Is it contemporary? (generally, you should write in the language you live in). Are there clichés which might be edited out?
Are there sentences which are too long and complicated, or which use too many adverbs and adjectives?
If there is dialogue, does it sound natural and idiomatic?

What do you think are the two strongest aspects of this writing?

What are two ways in which you think the piece could be improved?

Isolate the most common comments from your session to compare with the whole group at the end.
FEEDBACK COVER SHEET

Name:

.....................................................................................................

What I was trying to do in this piece of writing was:

.....................................................................................................

.....................................................................................................

.....................................................................................................

The kind of feedback I would like is (circle one):

critical
supportive
critically supportive
supportively critical

I would like feedback particularly on:

.....................................................................................................

.....................................................................................................

.....................................................................................................

.....................................................................................................
FEEDBACK RETURN SHEET

Try to comment briefly in all sections below.

Content:
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

Form:
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

Style and Language:
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

Two strongest aspects of this writing:
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

Two suggestions for improvement:
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

Any further suggestions or comments:
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................
Feedback Strategies in Writing Seminars

I'd be grateful if you could comment briefly on what you consider to be the **strengths** and **weaknesses** of the following methods of 'workshopping' new writing. These comments can be about both giving and receiving constructive criticism. Please add any ideas of your own: I am open to all suggestions. The important thing is that the workshops are as useful as possible for your own writing.

1) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback as a large group:
   - I personally hate reading aloud, but it does help me to spot mistakes I have made. Feedback from a large group is really good as the group often has ideas for plot, construction of the story etc.

2) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback in smaller sub-groups:
   - I prefer having feedback from larger groups as you often receive more ideas. Also people are more likely to speak their mind about a piece in a larger group.

3) Reading work aloud, completing written feedback forms in class:
   - Written boss feedback is probably my favourite because last semester I had a group of feedback forms that I could use to help edit my stories.

4) Your own suggestions:
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   - 
   -
Feedback Strategies in Writing Seminars

I'd be grateful if you could comment briefly on what you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the following methods of 'workshopping' new writing. These comments can be about both giving and receiving constructive criticism. Please add any ideas of your own: I am open to all suggestions. The important thing is that the workshops are as useful as possible for your own writing.

1) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback as a large group:

Some pieces have to be read out to an audience to get the best feel. Doing this with a large group enables everyone to say a point and probably don't generally get repeated.

2) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback in smaller sub-groups:

This is sometimes more relaxed but is hard to say a negative point about the work as people feel they are on the 'spot'.

3) Reading work aloud, completing written feedback forms in class:

This gives a good opportunity for saying what you really feel about the piece. However, it doesn't provide material for discussion as everyone is working on their own and points tend to get repeated.

4) Your own suggestions:

Perhaps the best way is to read the piece out loud in a large group, then each person in turn has to say one thing they liked then one thing they didn't like about it, then a questioning period after this for any responses.
Feedback Strategies in Writing Seminars

I'd be grateful if you could comment briefly on what you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the following methods of 'workshopping' new writing. These comments can be about both giving and receiving constructive criticism. Please add any ideas of your own: I am open to all suggestions. The important thing is that the workshops are as useful as possible for your own writing.

1) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback as a large group:
   It is immediate & allows us to give only the comments we choose, without feeling forced to comment on every aspect.

2) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback in smaller sub-groups:
   The closeness of a smaller group makes it difficult to make criticism, as opposed to the 'safety in numbers' of a bigger one: I don't like it.

3) Reading work aloud, completing written feedback forms in class:
   The different sections are good for pinpointing areas which might otherwise be overlooked, but they also add pressure to comment on things where you wouldn't normally, leading to insubstantial & padding comments.

4) Your own suggestions:
Feedback Strategies in Writing Seminars

I'd be grateful if you could comment briefly on what you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the following methods of 'workshopping' new writing. These comments can be about both giving and receiving constructive criticism. Please add any ideas of your own: I am open to all suggestions. The important thing is that the workshops are as useful as possible for your own writing.

1) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback as a large group:

2) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback in smaller sub-groups:

3) Reading work aloud, completing written feedback forms in class:

4) Your own suggestions:

---
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Feedback Strategies in Writing Seminars

I'd be grateful if you could comment briefly on what you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the following methods of 'workshopping' new writing. These comments can be about both giving and receiving constructive criticism. Please add any ideas of your own: I am open to all suggestions. The important thing is that the workshops are as useful as possible for your own writing.

1) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback as a large group:

- Giving: More individual to others' new suggestions, but others' points can lead to you seeing different aspects of the text, so more ideas.
- Receiving: Works better than small groups.

2) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback in smaller sub-groups:

- Can concentrate on pieces more closely, so more detailed criticism can be given, but some may be overlooked (as 1) as fewer opinions are given.
- It is more comfortable to give feedback, less intimidating.

3) Reading work aloud, completing written feedback forms in class:

- Forms provide an easy reference, when reviewing work. Squeeze ideas out of people due to the categorisation.
- Can be difficult to complete if the piece studied is only weak in larger groups.

4) Your own suggestions:

- [Handwritten notes]
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Feedback Strategies in Writing Seminars

I'd be grateful if you could comment briefly on what you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the following methods of 'workshopping' new writing. These comments can be about both giving and receiving constructive criticism. Please add any ideas of your own: I am open to all suggestions. The important thing is that the workshops are as useful as possible for your own writing.

1) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback as a large group:
   People feel they should say things so you get some good feedback. But people don't want to be so critical. Good though because people can expand on points others have made. Don't always get much from them all the
   
2) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback in smaller sub-groups:
   People are more trusting & will be happier to criticise. Easier to get than everyone work & can spend longer on each piece. More informal & people say more
   
3) Reading work aloud, completing written feedback forms in class:
   Feedback can be taken away. People think of criticisms. But it can be hard to think. People just give basic points. They tend to be basic. Usually get similar feedback each week
   
4) Your own suggestions:
   Sometimes we could hand work in to seminar tutors. I got feedback next week
I'd be grateful if you could comment briefly on what you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the following methods of 'workshopping' new writing. These comments can be about both giving and receiving constructive criticism. Please add any ideas of your own: I am open to all suggestions. The important thing is that the workshops are as useful as possible for your own writing.

1) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback as a large group:
   - Chance to hear from everyone, plenty of observations.
   - Critisims, improvements to work with.
   - More difficult to speak up, quieter people (like me!!)
   - Only 'louder' people do all the work, put forward all the comments, etc.
   - Very nervous to read in front of everyone!! (But probably good anyway)

2) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback in smaller sub-groups:
   - Easier to give honest feedback when it's to less people
   - Don't get to hear from everyone, fewer ideas/comments
   - Can spend more time on each piece of work

3) Reading work aloud, completing written feedback forms in class:
   - Really useful - when thinking back afterwards often difficult to remember things people have said, good to have feedback written down for future reference
   - However, takes quite a lot of time & effort, would be difficult to do for every piece of work, every week

4) Your own suggestions:
Feedback Strategies in Writing Seminars

I’d be grateful if you could comment briefly on what you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the following methods of ‘workshopping’ new writing. These comments can be about both giving and receiving constructive criticism. Please add any ideas of your own: I am open to all suggestions. The important thing is that the workshops are as useful as possible for your own writing.

1) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback as a large group:
   - Can be embarrassing for the writer (at least it is when the writer’s me). Sometimes, it is too fast to write down the comments, wider range of opinions and ability to argue/explain your intentions which you don’t get with written feedback.
   - I find it hard to take things in when I’m just listening rather than reading, particularly with long pieces. The good thing about the feedback form is that you can re-read the piece and think about responses. I floundered today when we were listening to several in a row, by the time it was finished, I preferred Ian’s method of re-reading. Hard to think of things to say for all the categories, but easier to be honest than with spoken feedback. More specific and detailed than oral feedback tends to be.

2) Reading work aloud, offering spoken feedback in smaller sub-groups:
   - More accessible to some people to think up things to say, but less embarrassing than large groups. Not such a wide range of opinions, we’re only bored it once but I didn’t really like this method.

3) Reading work aloud, completing written feedback forms in class:
   - Gives you written comments to take away and re-read. Hard to think of things to say for all the categories, but easier to be honest than with spoken feedback. More specific and detailed than oral feedback tends to be.

4) Your own suggestions:
   - Because I’m a fraud, I preferred Ian’s method of photocopying and distributing a few pieces each week instead of making everyone read theirs out but this is probably better for me. It means we get feedback on every piece.
### PART ONE CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING CREATIVE WRITING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70-100</td>
<td>Excellent, original work. Demonstrates full control in the manipulation and use of language. Maturity of expression, dexterity in negotiation of style and technique. Demonstrates clear understanding of the possibilities of structure. Full control of observed detail and clearly demonstrates the ability to edit text. Excellent presentation.</td>
<td>Relatively few students consistently gain marks of 70+ at Part One.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>Good work. Shows a high level of skill in overall control of language, structure and detailed observation. Largely effective negotiation of style and technique. Good, careful presentation.</td>
<td>Students gaining marks in the 60-69 band are usually considered to be performing very well at Part One.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Competent work. Demonstrates a competent control of language. Moderate awareness of structure, style and technique. Proficient presentation.</td>
<td>In most years about half the class gain marks in the 50-59 band at Part One. Such marks indicate that the student is making good progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>Acceptable work. Demonstrates some control of language and structure. Limited understanding of style and technique. Acceptable presentation.</td>
<td>A weighted average of 40 or above is required for entry to Part Two English &amp; Creative Writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Inadequate work. Little evidence of control of language. Insufficient knowledge of structure style and technique. Poor presentation.</td>
<td>Marks of 30-39 will count as pass marks for the purposes of passing Part One as a whole, but will not qualify a student for entry to Part Two English and Creative Writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-29</td>
<td>Fail. Inadequate understanding and use of language. Unsatisfactory grasp of structure. Total dependence on cliché and/or archaisms and generalities. Unacceptable presentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Draft Assessment Criteria for Level 2/3 Portfolios of Writing

70-100 Very Good-Excellent. Language controlled and particularised. A strong grasp of the techniques and style(s) of the chosen genre(s). Demonstrates an innovative and imaginative approach to form, style and content. Full control of narrative voice, dialogue, and the demands of tone, register and idiom. Stylistic fluency and technical accuracy in use of syntax and grammar. A high level of skill in self-editing and revision. Thorough discussion and evaluation of the writing in the accompanying critical commentary. Excellent presentation.


30-39 Inadequate. Inadequate control of language, technique and style. Heavy dependence on cliché and/or archaisms of generalities. Lack of awareness of genre style and techniques; scant control of narrative voice, dialogue or idiom. Technical errors may inhibit communication. Little or no evidence of self-editing or revision. Inadequate discussion and evaluation of writing in the critical commentary. Poor presentation.


Comment: 
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