

Here is an example of how other peers have reviewed my rough draft. I used my peer's review of my work to help me in the revising process of the rhetorical analysis. Gaining feedback from a new perspective was helpful to write a solid final draft of the rhetorical analysis.

1. **Riley Morse, College Campuses Should Not Be Safe Spaces Rhetorical Analysis**

2. **Thesis Statement:** The use of examples was successful to lead back to a now, more understood topic of how safe spaces are limiting.

1. The thesis could take a clearer stance on the effectiveness of the article. Explaining the examples would help.
2. Using a phrase like the examples is vague and making it clearer would help with the thesis statement

3. **MEAL Plan Paragraph structure:**

-Summary of the article

-Explaining an example from the article and how college students should let their opinions be heard.

-Another example about how monuments and emblems should be left up to show differing viewpoints

-Explaining how ethos was used and how he was a credible source

-Analysis on pathos and overall article

-Conclusion, wrapping it all up and explaining the effectiveness of the argument

1. Each paragraphs main idea is relevant to the thesis statement
2. Each main idea is supported by paraphrasing the article
3. The write does use analysis to explain the evidence and back it up.
4. Not every paragraph uses a transition, using them would help the paper flow more.
4. **Think about style and formality.** The author's intended audience is clearly established as the reader and the purpose could be a little clearer. Taking a more aggressive stance on whether the article was effective or not could help. The thesis doesn't necessarily reflect the view of whether the article was effective.
5. **Coherence and Clarity:** There were a few sentences where the structure could be better. For example, "Any discomfort is declared as out of bounds

when challenging your own views and ideas is essential to learning.” This is a confusing sentence and I’m not sure what the sentence is trying to say.

6. **Organization:** The paper doesn’t flow that well. In my opinion, the article talks about the same things in different paragraphs. The paper builds to a conclusion that talks about the paper overall and goes over the counterargument in the same paragraph.
 1. The introduction maps out the rest of the paper and does summarize the article. The next paragraph also summarizes the paper as well. The intro doesn’t really map out whether the article was effective or not.
 2. The conclusion does address the “so what?” question
7. **Elaboration:** In the paper, I find the part where he was teaching at the Bard Prison Initiative versus other schools. He said the inmates weren’t afraid to speak their minds and it led to greater discussions. This seems interesting to me and could lead to the credibility of the paper as a rhetorical strategy.
8. **Tangents:** The paper has things that all apply to the article. They are all examples that lead to the thesis.
9. **Final Comments:** I think more clearly stating whether the article was successful or not would help the writing. One thing that was good was all the evidence in the paper that supports the article.