

Dear Reading Group,

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a reviewing group for “The Best of Rhetoric and Composition.” Your role in this project is vitally important, and we appreciate your time, intellectual energy, and support of this project!

As we’ve discussed, our goal with this publication is to highlight the important work being published in print and digitally born independent journals in our field. These journals often work with few resources and little institutional support. Indeed, a principle concern of the publication will be to represent as wide a range of research interests, models, and publication formats as possible.

Within that framework, we have also worked hard to develop a list of reviewers who represent a wide range of interests and institutional locations. Among the reviewers are instructors teaching at research universities, comprehensive and regional institutions, community and liberal arts colleges. We have reviewers who are tenured and part adjunct faculty; M.A. and Ph.D. students. Out of this diverse pool, we hope to develop a consensus of what the best writing in our field looks like as developed in small and independent journals.

To enable these conversations, we have developed a set of criteria that we hope can guide your discussion and eventual ranking of essays. The goal is to take the complete set of over 30 articles and choose 12-16 articles to be included in the anthology. You are being asked to review and rank a sub-set of these nominated essays. As you begin your work, we would like your decision to be informed by the following:

- Only one article from any journal can be included in the anthology.
- No author can be included more than once in the anthology.
- No article should be excluded due to production concerns (length, inclusion of photos, blend of digital/print formats, etc.).

As you move to rank the articles, please *begin* with the following criteria to rank them:

- Article demonstrates a broad sense of the discipline, demonstrating the ability to explain how its specific focus in a sub-disciplinary area addresses broader concerns in the field.
- Article makes original contributions to the field, expanding or rearticulating central premises.
- Article is written in a style which, while based in the discipline, attempts to engage with a wider audience or concerns a wider audience.

When ranking, please use the following numeric scale:

3 - Article does an outstanding job with this criteria

2 – Article does a strong job with this criteria

1 – Article does an adequate job with this criteria

0- Article does not address this criteria

Additionally, it's likely that, as you read, new criteria will emerge through discussion. For that reason, we ask that you write a brief one-page summary of:

1. Your group's criteria
2. What criteria (either from above or from your conversations) guided your group's decision making process.

We need to have your list of selected essays no later than **December 15th**.

We look forward to working with you. If you have any questions, please feel free to write Kate Navickas ([knavickas2@gmail.com](mailto:knavickas2@gmail.com)) and Romeo Garcia ([rgarci05@syrr.edu](mailto:rgarci05@syrr.edu)).

Sincerely,

Steve Parks, Syracuse University

Adela Licon, University of Arizona

Brian Bailie, University of Cincinnati-Blue Ash

Romeo Garcia, Syracuse University

Kate Navickas, Syracuse University