# Peer Revision Strategy: PQP: Praise Question Polish

## Targeted Standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.6.5</td>
<td>With some guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach. (Editing for conventions should demonstrate command of Language standards 1-3 up to and including grade 6.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.7.5</td>
<td>With some guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach, focusing on how well purpose and audience have been addressed. (Editing for conventions should demonstrate command of Language standards 1-3 up to and including grade 7.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.8.5</td>
<td>With some guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach, focusing on how well purpose and audience have been addressed. (Editing for conventions should demonstrate command of Language standards 1-3 up to and including grade 8.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PQP (Praise, Question, Polish) revising strategy is appropriate for a second round of revision and editing during which students work with one another.

### Procedure:

1. The peer editor asks the author what his/her goals were for the paper.
2. A peer editor reads the author’s paper (of the author reads it aloud to the editor) and marks parts of the paper that are interesting and confusing using the following codes.
   - A box around interesting parts.
   - Underline at least one part that others will enjoy.
   - Place a ? next to any part that is confusing. Provide specific directions to the as to what the student is to mark as confusing. (i.e., “Did the writer address who, what, when, where and how?”)
3. The peer editor praises the author for the positive aspects and questions the author about the confusing parts.
4. The peer editor returns the paper to the author clarifying their suggestions for ideas to add or changes to make.
5. The author addresses the confusing parts marked on the paper and, if desired, makes changes suggested by the peer editor. Whenever a student elects to not make a requested or suggested modification, the student should be expected to adequately justify that decision.

### Attachment/Resources:

- NCTE Guidelines for Writing Groups:  

- Lesson Plan with Narrative Writing:  
  [http://www.readwritethink.org/classroom-resources/lesson-plans/peer-review-narrative-122.html](http://www.readwritethink.org/classroom-resources/lesson-plans/peer-review-narrative-122.html)
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