

Peer Reviews

My review for Marvin Mims position paper.

Western Medicine, Evolution and the Future of Humankind

1) Who seems to be the intended public audience for this piece? Can you suggest a more specific group of oppositional readers? What does the writer do to appeal to the beliefs, values, assumptions, emotions, and/or knowledge of intended readers? Provide the writer with additional strategies that will help engage and appeal to his or her intended audience.

The intended audience would be someone working in the medical field. I'm not exactly sure who the oppositional readers would be. I like the Charles Darwin quote at the very beginning it was intriguing and drew me in and I wanted to know more I like how this was presented.

2) What is the argument/position of your colleague? (If you don't know, you'll want to say so.) What are the argument's main claims? Point to sections where the position paper warrants further support or development and make suggestions for improvement.

I'm not exactly sure what the writers arugement is. I think it's that we need to stop with all the vaccines and antibiotics and just let nature take its course so that we aren't passing down weaker genes to our children. I think this paper could have been a little clearer on it's idea of the point is was making. It is a very well written paper I enjoyed reading it and I learned something new.

3) What middle ground does the writer establish with oppositional readers? If there is no middle ground, suggest one. What oppositional viewpoints are recognized? Are they combated effectively? Make additional suggestions for persuading the opposition. What differing perspectives or oppositional viewpoints are left out of the argument that should be addressed?

There was no middle ground that I could see. I didn't see anything in there that was against the arguement. I think the writer should talk a little more about how vaccines and antibiotics have helped us up to this point in modern times. I'm not someone who takes pills unless it's absolutely necessary I don't like them I think our bodies are made to fight off whatever happens to them. I think this paper portrays that really well and I like it. i think maybe the write should talk about people who have to take pills for everything and what it does to them as opposed to someone who doesn't that would be an interesting perspective.

4) Are at least three pieces of credible research integrated into the argument? Is there enough research to build credibility? Comment on how the research is presented, cited, and qualified—does the writer help readers understand who the sources are and why readers should trust those sources?

I can only clearly get two sources out of this paper and one of them is the Charles Darwin quote. I think the writer needs to make it more clear what they got from their research as well as cite it the same way it would be cited in a public setting. It is a really good paper but it's not really credible because the information about the 1940's and 1950's doesn't have a source tied to it so I don't even know where that came from.

5) Describe the design of the piece. How might this document appear more "real," like it actually would in the public sphere? How does the writer incorporate visual communication into his or her writing? How might the writer improve the design and visual elements of the paper?

Since we are in Canvas the formatting was lost and so were the pictures but the Darwin quote was a really unique idea. I liked that I'm a Psychology major so Darwin is dear to my heart. Plus I've seen is resting place in the Westminster Abbey in England so that was even more of a reason I wanted to read this.

6) What is the social context of the position paper; in other words, what ongoing conversation or debate does it enter into, or does it begin a new debate? Where might this writing appear in the public sphere? Is it a realistic context in terms of topic and timing (i.e., will readers find the topic relevant and interesting)? Why or why not? How might the writer put this document to action in the real world? How might the writer get this piece into circulation?

This would be found in a medical journal of some kind. I think the terminology the writer used was very appropriate for where you would find this piece of writing and I really liked that. It was somewhat hard to follow since I myself don't know what those terms mean but I'm sure a doctor would relate. Put it in a hospital or a medical school that would get it to circulate really fast.

7) Ask any questions you have about the paper—parts you don't understand, parts you disagree with, and so forth. What is one or more strength of this piece?

I'm not one to go to a doctor unless I'm dying so I agree with this paper. People are becoming too dependant upon drugs to keep them healthy when in fact you are weakening your immune system. I would say to just re-read this and make it clearer and easier to follow. Define the terms you use and put an opposition in somewhere. Overall it was really good and really interesting to read.

My peer review for Ala Brown's position paper.

Controversial Hits or Controversial Fines?

1) Who seems to be the intended public audience for this piece? Can you suggest a more specific group of oppositional readers? What does the writer do to appeal to the beliefs, values, assumptions, emotions, and/or knowledge of intended readers? Provide the writer with additional strategies that will help engage and appeal to his or her intended audience.

The intended audience seems to be anyone who plays football, watches football, reads about football, so pretty much football fans. I think an oppositional reader could still be football fans who just don't believe the same thing as someone else. The writer uses direct quotes from actual football players to strengthen their point and idea. I really liked how the writer wrote this paper in the sense that they seem to be very passionate about this and I like that.

2) What is the argument/position of your colleague? (If you don't know, you'll want to say so.) What are the argument's main claims? Point to sections where the position paper warrants further support or development and make suggestions for improvement.

The argument is that the vicious hit rule needs to be thrown out and no longer enforced in the fast paced game of football. The main claims in this argument is that there is no way to get around injury in this sport and to have a rule like this is going against what the game of football is. The paper has support through its use of quotes from football players I think that emphasizes the point.

3) What middle ground does the writer establish with oppositional readers? If there is no middle ground, suggest one. What oppositional viewpoints are recognized? Are they combated effectively? Make additional suggestions for persuading the opposition. What differing perspectives or oppositional viewpoints are left out of the argument that should be addressed?

There was no middle ground that I read in the paper. I think maybe the writer could say something about how this rule has helped out in some way but it still isn't necessary and shouldn't be enforced. If I disagreed with this I don't think I would have read the entire paper. But I really liked how the writer used a story at the beginning about their buddy who is for the rule. That really drew me in but that's the only thing I could find that would have involved a middle ground and if that is the middle ground maybe re-write it so it's easier to tell that it is.

4) Are at least three pieces of credible research integrated into the argument? Is there enough research to build credibility? Comment on how the research is presented, cited, and qualified—does the writer help readers understand who the sources are and why readers should trust those sources?

There are three pieces of credible evidence in the paper. It is cited correctly as it would be if it were in a public setting. There is more than enough research and I actually like how it's presented it flows nicely and it's easy to follow.

5) Describe the design of the piece. How might this document appear more "real," like it actually would in the public sphere? How does the writer incorporate visual communication into his or her writing? How might the writer improve the design and visual elements of the paper?

I think this piece would be in a sports magazine of some kind. But since this is on Canvas and we lost formatting and visuals there are none but I'm sure if there were they would be great.

6) What is the social context of the position paper; in other words, what ongoing conversation or debate does it enter into, or does it begin a new debate? Where might this writing appear in the public sphere? Is it a realistic context in terms of topic and timing (i.e., will readers find the topic relevant and interesting)? Why or why not? How might the writer put this document to action in the real world? How might the writer get this piece into circulation?

This piece would be in a sports magazine or even a newspaper. I have never heard anything about this rule and I have seven brothers and a dad who watch football and play it religiously so it was a new argument that I have never heard before. It brings up really good points it is very relevant to the intended audience and they would relate. To get this piece to circulate I would put it in a magazine or on a sports page something really public that would get a lot of hits.

7) Ask any questions you have about the paper—parts you don't understand, parts you disagree with, and so forth. What is one or more strength of this piece?

I really like this paper I think it's written well and it has a good flow to it. The only thing I would ask for more clarification on is the opposing side and the presentation of it. Other than that it's really good. Good job.

David Brown's peer review of my position paper.

1) Who seems to be the intended public audience for this piece? Can you suggest a more specific group of oppositional readers? What does the writer do to appeal to the beliefs, values, assumptions, emotions, and/or knowledge of intended readers? Provide the writer with additional strategies that will help engage and appeal to his or her intended audience.

This could apply to everyone. But to a specific group I would say parents with children. People who don't want kids for the sheer fact that they have responsibility they don't want. Draws me in with the incident that happened in Utah that changed law to prosecute at a federal level. Great paper, I felt I was going to read something about the Powell kids, something that devastating and something that got so much attention but regardless this had the same affect.

2) What is the argument/position of your colleague? (If you don't know, you'll want to say so.) What are the argument's main claims? Point to sections where the position paper warrants further support or development and make suggestions for improvement.

That kids who are abused don't have a voice, so we need to look for signs to speak for them. Law passed after a tragedy, why did it have to go that far? Why does it ever have to go that far for us to learn and put protective laws to stop it?

3) What middle ground does the writer establish with oppositional readers? If there is no middle ground, suggest one. What oppositional viewpoints are recognized? Are they combated effectively? Make additional suggestions for persuading the opposition. What differing perspectives or oppositional viewpoints are left out of the argument that should be addressed?

III be honest, from the get go I was passionate bout this paper because I have a son and a soon to be daughter, if there is a middle ground it flew right over my head. What measures does the state have to protect children? CPS? or even foster homes or group homes?

4) Are at least three pieces of credible research integrated into the argument? Is there enough research to build credibility? Comment on how the research is presented, cited, and qualified—does the writer help readers understand who the sources are and why readers should trust those sources?

Yes, I like the new federal law coming into place, wasn't sure why I wanted to know about a british society paper and how that relates to me here in Utah but even that flowed with the main points.

5) Describe the design of the piece. How might this document appear more "real," like it actually would in the public sphere? How does the writer incorporate visual communication into his or her writing? How might the writer improve the design and visual elements of the paper?

I can see this in the news, seriously. Like 60minutes!

6) What is the social context of the position paper; in other words, what ongoing conversation or debate does it enter into, or does it begin a new debate? Where might this writing appear in the public sphere? Is it a realistic context in terms of topic and timing (i.e., will readers find the topic relevant and interesting)? Why or why not? How might the writer put this document to action in the real world? How might the writer get this piece into circulation?

Ongoing conversation is children dying from neglect, abuse, being kidnapped and/or killed. There is plenty of this on the news so the public is well informed with the topic. I can see this in 60minutes

7) Ask any questions you have about the paper—parts you don't understand, parts you disagree with, and so forth. What is one or more strength of this piece?

More so of what other solutions are there like foster care or group homes. Could you maybe make a list of things or flags to watch for in an abused child... overall I enjoyed this piece!!!

Kelton Rich's peer review on my proposal idea.

I think this is a good idea for a proposal. It is important that we protect people especially children from know dangers. My only question is who would pay for such a project? Does the city own the canal or is it some other owner? This could be a reliability for them so you could talk about by putting up the fence they will stop others from being hurt and could save themselves from being sued. How big is the area where the canal is too? If it is a smaller area it would be really easy for them to do a bigger canal they might be able to just do it in areas that are more risky.

Ashlee Sanchez's peer review for my proposal.

Peer Review for Robynn Clayton

1. Robynn is responding to the hazardous issue of a dry creek in her neighborhood. She defines the problem by giving examples of why the creek is dangerous (5 foot drop with rocks at the bottom) how people get hurt (sledding down the hill, and why they don't see it (snow covering the hill)).
2. Her intended audience would be those in her community or those who are in charge of changes in residential areas (someone in the city).
3. She indicates the problem in the first paragraph where she describes where the creek is located and why people are getting hurt.
4. Her thesis statement is at the end of the first paragraph, "I propose the creek either be filled in or a fence put up around it."
5. Evidence provided would include her personal viewing of people sledding down the hill and getting hurt and the newspaper article of the car accident that happened. She addresses potential objection such as filling the creek would be costly, time-consuming, and would take too much 'man power'. A suggestion for the objections, I would move the quote from Intermountain

Healthcare about children getting hurt from bodies of water to the objections paragraph. It doesn't really fit where it is, but it would be perfect for that paragraph.

6. Robynn presents evidence mostly through narration and cause and effect analysis. She describes what happens when people sled down the hill and how they get hurt, but poses it through a neighbor's perspective.
7. I think the solution of adding a fence around it is very feasible. Chain link fences (like mentioned in the proposition) are fairly inexpensive and a fundraiser is a good idea for a way to pay for it if the city won't.
8. The solution asks the audience to either do a fundraiser or have the city fund it. It is an explicit action.
9. Pictures can't post because of format, but if you went through with this proposal, a picture of the creek or, even better, people sledding down the hill with the creek at the bottom would be awesome.
10. I think she establishes pathos by describing that it is children that get hurt, children of her neighbors. I think it really brings it to a personal level.
11. I didn't know about this creek, but there is one like it at my grandparent's house that is also dry and I didn't ever consider the possibility of people getting hurt if they went sledding down the hill where it's at. It is in a different location, but I see the potential problems. I think that Robynn was trying to get that point across, that it is dangerous and people need to be aware of that. I don't think she's trying to really change an opinion, but propose to take action on keeping people from being harmed because of this creek.
12. I really liked the proposed solutions to the issue and how she offered the objections to one and the likelihood of the other. I think the chain link fence is a cheap and very effective way to solve this issue. I also liked how she addressed the issue of cost and the different options she gave for raising money.